FBIS DAILY REPORT

# CONTENTS

*Soviet Union*

Vol III No 061 31 March 1987

USSR INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Possibility of Disarmament Agreement Viewed AA 1
Bogdanov: Not 'Hopeless' AA 1
Bovin Cites 'Complex Problems' AA 3
Difficulties 'Clearly Artificial' AA 4
[Orekhov in PRAVDA 28 Mar]
Zero Option 'Bluff' AA 5
Bovin Reiterates Condemnation of SDI AA 6
[IZVESTIYA 22 Mar]
U.S. Arms Buildup Seen As Threat to Planet [Ponomaryov] AA 8
U.S. Said To Violate Biological Convention AA 9
UN Regional Disarmament Conference Ends in Beijing AA 10
U.S.-Soviet Commission Session Begins in Geneva AA 11
Warsaw Pact, NATO Groups Hold Talks In Vienna AA 11
Correction to Vienna Consultations at Talks AA 11

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

'International Situation: Questions and Answers' CC 1
[Charikov, Zholkver, Fadeyev, Kulikov]

UNITED STATES & CANADA

TASS Comments on Reagan Speech to Executives [Ignatiyev] A 1
PRAVDA on 'Exaggerated' USSR Military Power [Gan, 27 Mar] A 2
Bogachev on 'Deliberate Lies' A 3
U.S. Receives Warsaw Pact Meeting Documents A 4
Fedonin Comments on New U.S. Pacific Command A 4

NORTHEAST ASIA

Akhromeyev Welcomes Mongolian Chief of Staff C 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Mar]
Sokolov Receives Jadambaa [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Mar] C 1
Moscow Korean Commentator Views 'Team Spirit' C 2
[(Bleskov)]
Correction to Commentator Assesses DPRK-S. Korea Dialogue C 2

SOUTH ASIA

DRA Protests to Pakistan About Attacks D 1
DRA Protests Iranian Violations of Airspace D 1
DRA's Wakil Sends Letter on Refugee Problem D 1
U.S. 'Hindrance' in DRA Settlement Claimed [Vavilov] D 2

Assistant to Envoy in Kabul Notes 'Troops Weary' D 3
[Kuwait AL-MUTJAMA' 10 Mar]
Paper On Plight of Veterans of Afghanistan D 4
[Morozov in RADYANSKA UKRAINA 17 Mar]
TASS Notes Pakistan-U.S. Ties 'Fuel' Arms Race D 6

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Trade Official Warns Malaysia on Imbalance E 1
[Kuala Lumpur BERITA HARIAN 14 Mar]

EASTERN EUROPE

PRAVDA Cites Polish Journalist on Restructuring F 1
[Rogowski, 24 Mar]

WESTERN EUROPE

Kornilov Questions State of UK Under Thatcher G 1
IZVESTIYA Berates UK Stance on War Criminals [Shafeta, 28 Mar] G 2
UK Delegation Continues Visit; Talks With Gorbachev G 3
Gorbachev-Thatcher 30 Mar Talks G 3
'Friendly' Talks; 'Controversy' G 6
Talks Assessed; Howe-Shevardnadze [London PRESS ASSOCIATION] G 7
Shevardnadze-Howe Talks 'Frank' G 8
Foreign Ministers Sign Protocol G 8
Thatcher Sees Sakharov, Ryzhkov [London PRESS ASSOCIATION] G 9
Thatcher Meets Peace Committee [IZVESTIYA 31 Mar] G 10
UK Coverage of Visit Noted G 10
[Sagaydak in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 31 Mar] G 10
Briefs: Shipping Commission With UK; Finnish Media Cooperation G 11

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

King Husayn, Parliamentarians Meet Delegation H 1
[IZVESTIYA 27 Mar]
Talyzin Stops Over in Aden, Meets PDRY Premier H 1

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

CPSU Delegation Attends Mexican Party Congress K 1
Central Committee Greetings [PRAVDA 25 Mar] K 1
KGB's Chebrikov Continues Visit to Cuba K 2
Castro-Chebrikov Meeting [PRAVDA 30 Mar] K 2
Moscow Carries Statement From Chilean Communists K 3

USSR NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

PRAVDA Details Experimental Election Rules [29 Mar] R 1
Volume of Anthology of CPSU Documents Published R 2
[PRAVDA 21 Mar]
Further Reports on March Journalists' Congress R 2
PRAVDA Cites Final Day [17 Mar] R 2
LE MONDE on Congress 'Clashes' [Paris, 18 Mar] R 3
PRAVDA Covers Debates [15 Mar] R 4

Rasputin Speaks on Openness, Environment R 10
[IZVESTIYA 15 Mar]
Budapest Media Interview Editors on 'Glasnost' R 10
Yakovlev, Korotich, Pyanov [Budapest Television] R 10
Bovin: 'Purifying Fire'[Budapest] R 13

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

'Bankruptcy' of Leningrad Building Trust Noted S 1
Restructuring in Petrochemical Industry Viewed S 1
[Lemayev in MOSCOW NEWS, 22 Mar]
Economist Abalkin Views System Updating S 5

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Agricultural Developments for 26-29 Mar T 1
Murakhovskiy Attends Agro-Industrial Meeting T 1

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

Moscow Radio Notes 'Astrophysical Module' Launch U 1
First in Series U 1
Launched by Proton Booster U 1

POSSIBILITY OF DISARMAMENT AGREEMENT VIEWED

Bogdanov: Not 'Hopeless'

LD302251 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 2020 GMT 30 Mar 87

[Report with recorded portion on interview with Radomir Bogdanov, deputy director of the USA and Canada Institute of Moscow, by correspondent Gabor Izbeki; Bogdanov speaks in Russian with superimposed Hungarian translation]

[Text] [Izbeki] Will there be a Soviet-U.S. summit meeting this year? Will Mikhail Gorbachev go to Washington in order to sign with Ronald Reagan the agreement on the disarmament of European medium-range missiles? This question occupies every politician today, and British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher is having talks in Moscow about, among other things, the possibilities for this agreement and the chances of reaching an understanding. There is nothing surprising about this, since it would be the first agreement of the nuclear age in which the contracting parties would be agreeing on a real reduction in the number of nuclear weapons and on their annihilation. The Soviet Union announced a few weeks ago that it was taking European weapons out of that certain Reykjavik package; that is to say, it was not making an agreement dependent on the Americans renouncing their Star Wars plans. However, the moment it became apparent that the draft agreement was virtually ready, the opponents of an agreement raised their voices.

The next time the two countries' diplomats will deal substantively with the issue will be when U.S. Secretary of State Shultz visits Moscow. Recently, Radomir Bogdanov, deputy director of Moscow's America Research Institute, visited Hungary. I had the occasion to talk to him about these issues. First of all, however, I asked him how much Soviet foreign policy is dependent on individuals, as Soviet foreign policy essentially changed after Mikhail Gorbachev was elected general secretary of the CPSU.

[Begin recording] [Bogdanov] Naturally, I do not deny that the new general secretary of the CPSU has made Soviet foreign policy dynamic, enriched it with new elements, new forms. As I see it, this is a legitimate phenomenon. But I also think it is much more important that Mikhail Gorbachev's new dynamism expresses the new realisms of the world situation, or to be more precise, also the (?understanding) of it. This means that the world's development has reached a decisive phase and it depends on our decisions today whether mankind survives or not, whether we go further along the path that leads to an eventual nuclear war or not. I would also draw attention to the fact that there is a close connection between the internal transformation of Soviet society and the change in foreign policy. Internal transformation requires detente, a world situation in which the danger of nuclear war is reduced. Internal transformation requires peaceful, calm conditions, in which the greatest possible material and intellectual forces can be placed in the service of internal, social development.

[Izbeki] Now both Soviet and U.S. diplomats are saying that the agreement on the disarmament of European medium-range missiles could be reached within a few months, perhaps half a year. What schedule do you consider to be realistic?

[Bogdanov] I would like to remind you that we wish to agree not only on the disarmament of medium-range missiles, but we are also ready to disarm our increased-range operational and tactical missiles as well, and our tactical nuclear weapons, too. We treat these weapons as a whole and we take into account the fact that these weapons make Western Europe uneasy.

As for when the plans will turn into an agreement, that depends to a large extent on the stance of the U.S. side; or, to be more precise, on how the power relations develop in the near future with the members of the U.S. Government. The agreement is, in essence, ready on paper; all that is missing are the signatures.

[Izbeki] So, does that mean Mikhail Gorbachev is willing to go to Washington to sign the agreement if the U.S. side also wants that.

[Bogdanov] Regarding the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, I say well in advance that one must not give rise to illusions and await the remaining months of the year with unfounded hopes. This much I can say: that if all that is now needed for an agreement is the meeting of politicians, then that will not be lacking. But I stress once again that this depends on what the final agreement is like, what it contains.

[Izbeki] The people of the Soviet Union and Europe, then, are hoping there will be an agreement. At the same time, as the hopes grow, in the United Sttes the alliance of political interests that would like to obstruct the emergence of this agreement is also gathering strength. You know the United States well; what tools do they hold in their hands? Will they have the strength to reverse today's favorable processes?

[Bogdanov] I think you have put your finger on the main point. I also think the fate of the agreement depends on whether in the United States the supporters of an agreement or its opponents gain the upper hand. I would very much like to believe that this U.S. Government and the present U.S. President have enough political will, strength, and determination to sign this really fateful agreement. We, however, think that the political basis of today's U.S. administration is on the right wing of U.S. social and economic life. The government itself has been organized out of people who stand on that side. We are aware that for the U.S. President it is not at all easy to make himself independent of these circles, not even if he wants to do so. In addition, the preparations for the Presidential election, due in 18 months, have already begun; therefore, even if we formulate it carefully, I must say that the situation is complex. Still, it can be calculated that the opponents of the Soviet-U.S. agreements, and in concrete terms of the agreement on European weapons, will gather strength. Moreover, it will depend on Reagan personally, and on his immediate environment, whether there will be an agreement.

[Izbeki] Does one not have to fear perhaps that while the U.S. Government might sign the agreement on the reduction of European weapons, it might in exchange totally commit itself to the Star Wars plans?

[Bogdanov] The U.S. administration now wants Reagan, in his remaining 23 months, to get far enough in developing space weapons for the next President to have to continue this program as a matter of course. They want to reinterpret the former Soviet-U.S. agreements so that they might conduct space weapon experiments in space as well. There are many opponents of this action in the United States: for example, the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Sam Nunn. But the government, despite this, is doing everything in the interest of developing space weapons.

[Izbeki] If that is going to be so, then is it worth concluding any agreement at all with the United States? What will be the Soviet Union's response in the event of Washington's extending its space weapon experiments to the cosmos?

[Bogdanov] The most important task, naturally, is for us not to permit this. That is, we should not permit the arms race to reach a new phase that would be completely unverifiable. Unfortunately, it seems to me that the Americans can not be dissuaded from their Star Wars plans for now. In this case, the Soviet Union will have to respond. This response does not mean necessarily that we shall also deploy space weapons; but we shall strive to develop much more cheaply a sufficient, effective defense against the U.S. cosmic weapons. I repeat, however, that we do not want a new wave in the arms race; moreover, we would like to return to a lower level of balance.

[Izbeki] This is understandable. At the same time, many people do not place trust in the success of the talks; neither do they trust that the arms race can be curbed at all.

[Bogdanov] Well, I must say that the limitation of the arms race is by no means a hopeless thing. After all, in your time there have been two SALT agreements in this regard. It has been possible to stop nuclear explosions in the atmosphere and under water; furthermore, we have also limited the strength of underground explosions. This always proves that if the situation is ripe, then there is a possibility for agreements. The agreement is now also ready on the disarmament of European medium-range missiles. The only thing that is difficult is to disarm the opponents of agreement. But if we have enough firmness, consistency, and willingness for discussions, then we can attain results in this field.

[Izbeki] Will flexibility now remain the key word in Soviet foreign policy?

[Bogdanov] The key word, or the key words, are realism, consistency, and flexibility, and readiness to compromise. [end recording]

## Bovin Cites 'Complex Problems'

LD132113 Bratislava Domestic Service in Slovak 1730 GMT 13 Mar 87

[Report on interview with IZVESTIYA political observer Aleksandr Bovin, by Moscow correspondent Stefan Simak; Bovin replies in Russian fading into Slovak report; date and place not given -- recorded]

[Text] Without a doubt, one of the most important foreign political events this year has been the Soviet proposal for scrapping medium-range missiles in Europe. As we know, the U.S. effectively approved of this step in proposal form and yesterday submitted its proposal for verification for possible agreement at the Soviet-U.S. disarmament dialogue in Geneva. The Soviet Union agrees to on-site verification; in other words, to U.S. experts being present at the destruction of Soviet missiles, and Soviet experts, in turn, at the destruction of U.S. ones. However, it insists unequivocally on reciprocity. Western political commentators are trying to assess this approach optimistically. What, though, is the view of Aleksandr Bovin, political observer of the Soviet daily IZVESTIYA? Stefan Simak invited him to reply in this interview:

[Bovin] (?On that occasion) I stressed that in this case I would be happy to be proved wrong, and that is still the case, but I suggest that we do not run ahead of ourselves, that we wait a while. Some time could elapse before an agreement is signed because a large number of rather complex problems will have to be resolved, primarily in respect of verification.

So far we still cannot rule out the possibility that just at the decisive moment when a decision has to be made on whether or not to sign the agreement, the Americans will not spring yet another surprise on us in connection with their favorite subject of verification, and not block that process, Aleksandr Bovin stressed.

[Simak] Some elements of bourgeois propaganda these days are saying that the Soviet Union has made a carefully calculated move: the United States is suffering from the Irangate syndrome, President Reagan is nearing the end of his tenure, and an agreement with the Soviet Union would help him heal many of his wounds. I asked comrade Bovin what he thought.

[Bovin] I think that like any government, our government always makes a comprehensive assessment of the situation. Of course, we are taking into account the situation in which the United States finds itself today, and the one in which President Reagan finds himself. The important thing for us, however, is not what is actually happening in the United States, but how it affects the development of Soviet-U.S. relations. Of course we are trying to make use of anything that could have a positive effect on those relations. Reagan's domestic problems can be seen as a certain stimulus for seeking an agreement with the Soviet Union -- that is logical and of course we will try to make use of that logic, Aleksandr Bovin stated.

[Simak] If an agreement was, indeed, signed on medium-range missiles, an avalanche of new agreements could follow too, for example on operational-tactical missiles, conventional weapons and so forth. But is the world ready for such a jump?

[Bovin] I am not really sure that it is a matter of taking jumps. Instead we need to take gradual and consistent steps toward a definite goal. After all, if someone wants to learn to swim, he first has to get into the water. If we can take the first step, more steps will follow. But you have to start somewhere, so why not start with medium-range missiles and while we are moving toward an agreement on that, the world will prepare itself for further disarmament, Aleksandr Bovin concluded.

## Difficulties 'Clearly Artificial'

PM301053 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Mar 87 First Edition p 5

["Commentator's Column" by Boris Orekhov: "Europe and Missiles"]

[Text] The working group on medium-range missiles has gone into recess at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva.

This working group and its doings are now the focus of universal attention. This is not hard to explain: A vitally important problem affecting the interests of every European -- freeing the continent of missiles weapons -- is being discussed.

We will use this pause in the talks to look back and try to interpret what is happening in Geneva and around it.

A month has passed since the Soviet Union proposed separating the problem of medium-range missiles from the general complex of issues and concluding a separate agreement on it without delay. Why is it so urgent? The fact is that there is every reason for posing the question in this way: not only the basis for such an accord exists, but even an actual accord itself. [paragraph continues]

Remember Reykjavik. It was established there that the USSR and the United States would remove all their medium-range missiles from Europe in the next 5 years.

Our country has expressed willingness to withdraw its increased-range operational and tactical missiles from the GDR and the CSSR -- with the consent of these countries' governments -- which were situated there as a countermeasure to the deployment of Pershing-2 and cruise missiles in Western Europe in accordance with NATO's well known "two-track decision." This would only be possible after an agreement has been signed on removing medium-range missiles from Europe. With regard to other operational and tactical missiles, the USSR has expressed readiness to immediately begin talks aimed at reducing and ultimately totally eliminating them.

In short, what else is needed to reach an accord now, after the Soviet proposal of 28 February?

Today, however, it is becoming clear that the way to reaching an agreement on medium-range missiles is not so simple, although the difficulties encountered are clearly artificial. Moreover, statements by some high-ranking U.S. figures cast doubt on the sincerity of Washington, which once put forward the "zero option." We also cannot fail to be put on guard by the attempts of certain forces in Western Europe to prolong the search for a solution to the missile problem and surround it with all manner of conditions and provisions from the so-called "position of strength."

We will frankly say that any procrastination in freeing our European home from its nuclear burden is not only wasted time but also a dangerous game that is clearly not in the interests of the European People. One would think that in this situation the peoples and political figures in NATO countries could be expected to display political maturity and do everything in their power to promote the reaching of an accord in Geneva which is awaited by Europe and the rest of the world.

## Zero Option 'Bluff'

LD290816 Moscow TASS in English 0626 GMT 29 Mar 87

[Text] Moscow March 29 TASS -- The national daily PRAVDA said today all indications were that the U.S. Administration's "Zero Option" proposal had been bluff all along.

It made the remark in a comment on the U.S. reaction to a Soviet initiative for signing an agreement without delay to destroy all American and Soviet "Euromissiles."

The paper said that the idea was being enthusiastically discussed by the governments and leading political parties in Europe.

People in all European countries without exception supported the Soviet Union's Intermediate-Range Nuclear Force (INF) proposal and its stated readiness to withdraw shorter-range theater missiles from the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia, in agreement with their governments, right after signing an INF accord.

"After the initial and fairly favorable response to the Soviet proposal, there has ensued a pause in Washington," PRAVDA wrote.

"It has often been this way also before -- to gain time for regrouping forces," it added.

The paper also pointed to reports of the U.S. Army's deputy chief of staff saying that if a "Euromissile" agreement was reached with the Soviet Union, the American Army was going to convert NATO's intermediate-range missiles into shorter-range ones.

It had become known a few days after that the idea "was not a product of the general's fever-driven imagination but was effectively Washington's official position at the talks in Geneva," PRAVDA added.

"If things go this way, practically all 108 Pershing-2's will be left in Europe -- along with their service facilities," it said.

"At the Pentagon, in point of fact, they do not want elimination of INF missiles in Europe, and the 'Zero Option' proposal appears to have been bluffing by the U.S. Administration from the very beginning," PRAVDA concluded.

BOVIN REITERATES CONDEMNATION OF SDI

PM260941 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Mar 87 Morning Edition p 4

[Political observer A. Bovin ariticle: "SDI. Four Years On"]

[Text] On 23 March 1983 U.S. President R. Reagan called on U.S. scientists to create [sozdat] means for a strategic ABM defense which could render nuclear weapons "powerless and obsolete."

Let us examine the President's logic. Hitherto, he noted, aggression (Soviet, of course) was prevented by the threat of a retaliatory strike; it was assumed that no sensible side would deliver a strike which would inevitably lead to unacceptable losses being inflicted on it (the concept of mutual assured destruction). But, the President declared, it is better to save people than to avenge the dead: "Man's spirit must be able to rise above the maintenance of relations with other countries and other people on the basis of threatening their existence." People would be able to "live in tranquillity" if they knew that the United States were capable of intercepting and destroying the enemy's strategic ballistic missiles long before they approached U.S. territory.

The President admitted that this constitutes "a most difficult technical task and that it may not be solved before the end of the century." All this time the United States must "invariably preserve the nuclear deterrent forces and a reliable potential of flexible response." The President understood that the preservation of offensive systems in combination with the creation [sozdaniye] of defensive ones may be perceived as preparation for aggression. But, R. Reagan assured, Washington has no such intentions.

There was a stormy reaction to the President's initiative in the United States. His supporters lauded to the skies the "strategic revolution" and the promotion of defense interests to the forefront. His opponents derided the illusionism of the White House chief and his faith in the efficiency of a space-age "Maginot Line." The majority of "average Americans" applauded the man who was at last averting the death threat hanging over them and who was promising them a lasting and reliable defense. The U.S. allies, having overcome their confusion, cautiously backed the line of ABM research. [paragraph continues]

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries described the "Star Wars" idea as provoking a new spiral of the arms race and leading to further destabilization of international relations. The nonaligned movement drew similar conclusions.

Four years have passed since. The "initiative" has acquired a solid organizational, scientific, and production apparatus. The first few billions have been spent. But arguments are still going on. And it seems to me that the SDI's defenders are gradually beginning to abandon conceptual positions. In any case, the flaws and vulnerable spots in their arguments have grown larger and more noticeable in these 4 years.

First and foremost, there has been an erosion and virtual repudiation of R. Reagan's main and central idea -- the possibility of creating [sozdaniye] an "absolutely" impenetrable ABM system, guaranteeing the destruction of all attacking missiles. No matter how much antimissile technology may improve, it is virtually impossible to imagine a situation whereby the totality of special countermeasures and the modernization of offensive potential would not allow a "penetration" of the potential for defense.

Not a cessation or a slowdown of the arms race, but its whipping up, its "enrichmemt" with a new meaning, with a competition between the space "shield" and the nuclear "sword" -- this is the shape that the specific and tangible result of Reagan's initiative is assuming. This result completely rules out any opportunity of turning nuclear weapons into a heap of "powerless and obsolete" scrap metal.

Let us use the analogy suggested by R. Reagan himself. In upholding his initiative, he compared the ABM system with antiaircraft artillery. But what does such a comparison show? This is what it shows. The appearance of antiaircraft artillery and sophisticated air defense systems not only failed to render bomber aviation "powerless and obsolete," but gave a boost to efforts to build up its ability to overcome air defense systems. How can one doubt that the creation [sozdaniye] of ABM defense would have exactly the same effect with nuclear weapons.

While continuing to utter ritual words about the need for an "absolute" ABM defense, the Americans have, to judge by all accounts, opted for a bird in the hand rather than two in the bush. Emphasis has switched to the creation [sozdaniye] of a limited ABM system, covering in its first stage only the most important military installations and command centers. Why? You can't say: So that Americans could "live in tranquillity," because the umbrella is being spread not over them but over weapons and the top brass. So, why indeed? For the purpose of stability, they reply. And go on to explain: If the "Russians" knew that a certain (unspecified) number of their missiles will be "caught" by the ABM defense, it will be more difficult for them to compute a counterforce and countercontrol strike and the likelihood of such a strike will diminish.

But the "Russians" are in no way bound to think or act the way the Americans want them to. Would it not be more logical to assume that they would rather preserve the existing kill potential [potentsial porazheniya] and increase the number of missiles for this purpose? This means that the option for action by the Pentagon also provokes the arms race and the buildup of nuclear weapons, in other words leads not to stronger but to weaker stability.

The 4 years of arguments and deliberations, the 4 years of "modernization" of offensive forces by the Americans have proved that the Pentagon's actions are losing their inner contradictoriness and are becoming fully explicable in just one way: The United States, by combining the means of offense and defense, strives to gain strategic advantages over the Soviet Union. It did not work with MIRV's. It did not work with cruise missiles. But this "technological supermanship" complex continues to roll. This is where the "Russians" will be unable to keep up with us.

And what of the future? The future is one of the numerous scenarios of "limited war" with guaranteed "victory" (in this context victory means survival). If the "Russians" were to attack, we would manage to substantially weaken their strike and take them out of the game by means of our counterstrike. And if we were to attack, our strike would weaken the "Russians'" counterstrike to such an extent that our ABM defense would cope with it in a more or less satisfactory fashion. In either case, the States suffers less damage, which means that it finds itself in a more favorable position.

The most dangerous point is the fact that the Washington leadership could take all this nonsense seriously and start....

The Soviet Union's stance is simple and has been repeatedly stated. We will never allow anyone to break the strategic parity or gain strategic superiority. This is not even a theorem. It is an axiom. We actively support the idea of rendering nuclear weapons powerless and obsolete. We have proposed to eliminate them altogether. From our point of view, however, it is not at all necessary to launch combat systems in space in order to get rid of nuclear weapons on Earth. We propose a simpler and shorter path: To embark on disarmament on Earth immediately, without wasting any time or money on the militarization of space.

So far we have been unable to convince the Americans. And there is something else. The Reagan administration is clearly trying to step up the development [razrabotka] of the "Star Wars" program in order to commit its successors more rigidly and tightly, making it more difficult for them to make an independent evaluation of the situation and an independent choice. But the "point of no return" has not yet been reached, and the Soviet Union will consistently advocate that outer space be free of weapons. Discussions in the last few years have convinced us that there is no other sensible stance.

U.S. ARMS BUILDUP SEEN AS THREAT TO PLANET

LD270552 Moscow TASS in English 1846 GMT 26 Mar 87

["Commenary on the Folly of the Nuclear Arms Race" -- TASS headline; all quotation marks as received]

[Text] Mocow March 26 TASS -- TASS news analyst Leonid Ponomaryov writes:

Wise people's counsel is never tell a desert dweller about mountains. He either will not understand you or will consider you a liar because he did not see anything higher in his life than a camel.

And still, there is a kind of mountains which should be unceasingly mentioned to such nuclear desert advocates as U.S. Secretary of Defence Caspar Weinberger: the mountains of nuclear weapons which have been stockpiled in the world by now.

Soviet specialists' estimates are that, nuclear powers have got more than 50,000 nuclear weapons as of today.

It is much or little, and what can measure their destructive capability, the extent or potential of destruction?

The present U.S. Administration maintains that the Pentagon has got an insufficient nuclear might, and unfolds additional programmes, including a space-based anti-missile defense system which is called the 'Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI).

If, say, one dot on the page of an ordinary school exercise-book signifies the aggregate power of all explosives which mankind used in all wars from the days when firearms were invented to the last day of World War Two, all the other space of the page would correspond to the comparative yield of the existing stocks of nuclear weapons! Stunning, is it not?

What is the point, query, to go on stockpiling nuclear weapons the amount of which is quite enough to cardinally change the nature of our planet in the solar system in the event of a simultaneous detonation? [sentence as received]

The Soviet Union suggests stopping the process of the nuclear arms race, reducing and then completely eliminating the stocks of nuclear weapons. The United States in words is for 'arms control', while in practice it whips up the arms race still further.

U.S. nuclear programmes are aimed at building up strategic offensive potential alone up to 20,000 nuclear weapons by the beginning of the nineties.

In a period of 1986-1989 alone, the Pentagon is planning to produce more than 17,000 new nuclear weapons of various yield and purpose.

In the name of what purposes is the folly of building up the power of the nuclear death being continued? The present U.S. Administration seeks to achieve military superiority, and an absolute one, over the Soviet Union and its allies at all costs, apparently, even at the price of threatening the existence of our planet itself.

At the summit meeting in Reykjavik the Soviet Union put forward a package of proposals which, if accepted, could within a short period of time lead to a fundamental change in all directions in the issue of reaching accords on limiting and eliminating nuclear weapons, and would make it possible to start making headway towards a nuclear-free world.

The U.S. Administration, instead of embarking upon the road of nuclear disarmament, took the path of militarising outer space and of preparing for "Star Wars".

U.S. SAID TO VIOLATE BIOLOGICAL CONVENTION

LD301342 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1255 GMT 30 Mar 87

[Text] Moscow, 30 Mar (TASS) -- In its latest edition, the "Voyennyy Vestnik" of the NOVOSTI Press Agency reports that our editorial office is in possession of a document testifying to the fact that there are 30 formulae for biological weapons in the aresenal of the U.S. Army.

After 30 July 1981, the bulletin says, a new instruction is the basic document regulating the operations by escort parties accompanying convoys of biological ammunition, and also vessels with such materials, agents, and formulae. The instruction stipulates the rules of transporting biological formulae, or ammunition charged with them, containing toxins or the instigators of 30 infections.

Matters of organiziang the transport of biological ammunition are in the hands of the military transport command of the U.S. Army and of the committee on ensuring safety in handling explosive substances of the U.S. Defense Department.

The basic tenets of the instructions FM3-20 are in keeping with NATO standards and the quadrilateral agreement on standardization between the United States, Britain, Canada and Australia, the "Voyennyy Vestnik" points out.

UN REGIONAL DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE ENDS IN BEIJING

LD272232 Moscow TASS in English 2150 GMT 27 Mar 87

[Text] Beijing March 27 TASS -- TASS correspondent Grigoriy Arslanov reports:

The U.N. regional five-day conference held here has been a positive contribution to solution of complicated problems of disarmament, building up measures of confidence and mutual understanding between states and peoples in the vast region of the world.

The conference held within the framework of the world campaign for disarmament for Asian and Pacific countries, brought out the community of destinies and interests of the peoples of Asia, the continent where American atomic bombs were exploded for the first time in mankind's history and where there is a whole network of foreign military bases, where conflicts are taking place. Participants in the conference meanwhile pointed to positive phenomena. One of them is that the two great nuclear powers of the region, the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China, declared they would not be the first to use nuclear weapons.

In the course of discussions the delegates expressed concern over the fact that the process of building up armaments is also spreading to developing countries, including the Asian-Pacific region, with one solider per 44 people and only one doctor per 1,030 people.

The conference favourably responded to the Soviet proposals for establishing a universal system of international security, and also the idea of establishing nuclear-free zones. The conference declared for continuation of the dialogue on questions of Asian security.

The U.S. representative, who advocated nuclear intimidation, failed to summon up support of the participants in the forum.

Talking to the TASS correspondent, Deputy Foreign Minister of the USSR V.F. Petrovskiy underlined the great significance of the fact that the forum had been held in the capital of the People's Republic of China, a great socialist country with a population of 1,000 million. And it is difficult to overestimate the role of that country in the struggle for peace and disarmament, in building up measures of confidence, establishing mutually advantageous constructive cooperation between countries of the Asian-Pacific region.

He said that the USSR and the People's Republic of China had a high stake in consolidation of peace and stability not only in that region but also in the whole world, the early solution of the problem of nuclear disarmament without which there can be no durable peace and wholesome economic development of all countries.

At the concluding meeting the participants in the conference were unanimous in saying that the conference on the whole attained its goal -- establishment and development between countries of the region of a dialogue based on mutual understanding of the importance and complexity of the problems raised, promotion of the quest for new constructive ways of solving the problem of disarmament and settling conflict situations, establishing a reliable system of security.

U.S.-SOVIET COMMISSION SESSION BEGINS IN GENEVA

LD191104 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 19 Mar 87

[Text] A routine session of the Soviet-U.S. Permanent Consultative Commission has opened in Geneva. It was set up in accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding between the USSR and U.S. Governments of 21 December 1972 to facilitate the implementation of the goals and provisions of the strategic arms limitations agreements and on measures to lessen the danger of nuclear war breaking out, concluded between the USSR and the United States.

WARSAW PACT, NATO GROUP HOLD TALKS IN VIENNA

LD301323 Moscow TASS in English 1315 GMT 30 Mar 87

[Text] Vienna March 30 TASS -- A regular meeting was held here today within the framework of unofficial consultations of representatives of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO member countries on the problem of the reduction of the armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe.

A Soviet delegation called the attention of the meeting on the results of the session of the foreign ministers' committee of the Warsaw Treaty member countries held in Moscow. The urgent need was emphasized for working to bring down the level of military confrontation in Europe by means of reciprocal stage-by-stage and substantial reduction of the armed forces and conventional armaments. In the opinion of the Soviet side, the consultations started here should promote the passing over to concrete talks on disarmament in Europe on an all-European basis.

CORRECTION TO VIENNA CONSULTATIONS AT TALKS

The following correction pertains to the item headlined "'Unofficial Consultations' at MBFR Talks," published in the 27 March Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page AA 12:

Headline should read "'Unofficial Consultations' Held in Vienna" (rewording).

'INTERNATIONAL SITUATION: QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS'

LD290900 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1700 GMT 27 Mar 87

["International Situation: Questions and Answers" program, recorded on 24 March during a meeting between All-Union Radio international affairs journalists and the collective of the Uralmash Works in Sverdlovsk; presented by commentator Igor Pavlovkh Charikov; with political observer Aleksandr Vladimirovich Zholkver; commentator Vladimir Ivanovich Fadeyev; and international affairs journalist Vladimir Semenovich Kulikov]

[Excerpts] [Charikov] Hello, esteemed comrade Uralmash workers. You are direct participants today in our flagship program "International Situation: Questions and Answers," which goes out every week on Fridays. Our writers, who vary, base this program upon letters received from listeners, letters asking questions about various aspects of the international situation. We, our team, have decided to push back, so to speak, the walls of the studio and record this program among a live audience, during direct communication with you and, naturally, so that the recording of this program should then go on the air next Friday, the 27th, on the first program of All-Union Radio. So we invite you to start our program off. Please.

[Mironov] History teacher from No 1 Rural Vocational-Technical College, Yuriy Vasiliyevich Mironov. Restructuring is underway in our country. It seems to me that this restructuring is reflected in our relations with foreign countries, and, incidentally, the CEMA countries. What are the main nonantagonistic contradictions between the CEMA countries that are hindering the development of socialist economic integration today? Enterprises in the CEMA countries have started in earnest to develop direct production ties, but how are they to deal with differing price-setting systems, how are profits to be divided, how are they to have effective information and communication, and what about the complex procedure for making out documentation? Those are the questions, since our restructuring must also take place in some way among our partners.

[Charikov] Right, thank you. Well, your question is a pretty full one, it touches upon both restructuring and ways of developing mutual relations between CEMA member states, in all their aspects. Who's to start? I think, Aleksandr Vladimirovich?

[Zholkver] You have noted correctly, Yuriy Vasiliyevich, that questions of restructuring really do affect not just our country, and, incidentally, not just our friends, but also our foes -- perhaps we'll talk about that later -- but, naturally, it affects first and foremost, and directly concerns the countries of the socialist community with whom we are linked by very close and, of late, direct ties, as you already have mentioned. I would like to talk, for example, about the recently held plenum of the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee, which fully supported and approved the decisions adopted at the January congress [as heard] of our party. But this is what is curious: In the entire common nature of the problems facing our countries, in the whole range of the objective difficulties of the socialist countries related to the general world situation and to certain difficulties within these countries -- and we also shall have more to say about that today -- there are, of course, patterns in common, too.

All the socialist countries now are going through a stage of acceleration, a stage when widespread reconstruction is underway, both in industry and in agriculture and, naturally, also in the development of our ties. But nobody sees this stage as a direct copy, neither of all our experience by the socialist countries, nor the reverse.

You will recall that at the 27th CPSU Congress, the political report of the Central Committee stated that we also have followed most attentively the development of socialist industrial relations in the fraternal countries and made use of everything that was outstanding and important to us.

So, first of all, I would like to say that this is a two-way, not a one-way, street. I have to confess that in the past we took a somewhat primitive attitude toward this problem. As has already been mentioned, I happen to have worked for many years in the GDR, and there they had a slogan -- the general idea of which was correct and understandable -- Learning from the Soviet Union is learning to triumph; there is no doubt about the correctness of this slogan today.

However, it must be said that the German comrades, the German Communists, at that time did not take a primitive attitude to that slogan, imitating everything. You have to study the specific nature of each socialist country. The GDR is a highly-developed industrial state, with a very high standard of production, and here it is we who have to catch them up in a whole range of things. Incidentally, the issue of using the experience of the socialist countries, including the GDR, was widely discussed at the last, the 11th, SED Congress. I was fortunate to accompany our delegation to the congress, which was headed by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, and which made use of every free minute, even the intervals between sessions, to visit enterprises, although only in Berlin. It must be said that Mikhail Sergeyevich most graphically pointed out those sproutings of innovation which our German friends have that are important for us. We invited, for example, the 7 October Works -- the Krasnyy Proletariy works has long had ties with this enterprise -- a machine-tool works, of course, nothing approaching the size of Uralmash, where we are today and where we have been able to acquaint ourselves with just a very small part, but which has long-standing ties. Before that I visited the Ernst Thaelmann combine in Magdeburg, with whom you have closer ties. We talked about really making front-rankers' experience known to all, but once again not just copying each other in primitive fashion. You see how Comrade Husak, at the CPCZ Central Committee plenum that I mentioned, spoke of this: No one intends to foist upon Czechoslovakia the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee, but we shall study everything that could help us in achieving the drafts of the 17th CPCZ Congress and will use them as they apply to our conditions.

Why am I talking about this in this way? Because it has to be said straight out that all kinds of radio voices are now putting out quite a lot of assertions alleging that confusion virtually has set in in some socialist countries. So, they say, restructuring is underway in the Soviet Union -- and there are ample problems with this restructuring; we have seen that you at Uralmash have ample problems, and we do not conceal that here -- and, they say, the socialist countries do not know how to act in this instance. The problems that exist in these countries are prompting them of their own accord to start this restructuring -- of course, altered to fit each specific country.

I mentioned the GDR. Our delegation to the congress visited the Institute for Management of the Socialist National Economy, that is, for socialist planning. They make wide use there and introduce from there these CADS [computer assisted design system], some of you will have come across this automated design system, probably, which enables you to speed up the design process many times over both in construction and in industry; and we talked about how, on the one hand, to introduce this design system more rapidly and, on the other hand, how to train people in this. It is not just a matter of buying these CADS, say, in the GDR or here, too -- these are frequently made in sets -- but of people using them, and here we really are on new ground. So, coming back to your question, Yuriy Vasiliyevich, I would say that of course it is not just that there are no antagonistic contradictions between our countries; the thing is to merge the specific nature of each country with the general tasks of the socialist community.

It was no accident that I spoke about the Czechoslovak Communist Party plenum, because I know that you at Uralmash have particular ties with the Skoda works in Czechoslovakia and, by the way, as we were going round the workshops we saw machine-tools bearing the Skoda mark in many workshops; we also found out that in the near future you will be signing an intercombine, if I can put it like that, agreement establishing direct ties between Uralmash and Skoda. This will provide the opportunity not only for us to set up bilateral cooperation, but also for us to take our products out to third countries since Uralmash, like 70 other major enterprises of the Soviet Union, now has the opportunity to go directly out onto the foreign market, both for the export of its products and for the purchase of products abroad.

Of course, this is a new thing, and there is much that has to be changed in order to do it, not only in the organizational field, but on the purely psychological level. It is not an easy path, and there will probably be both difficulties and errors here, but it is precisely by utilizing joint experience and joint potential that, I say with confidence, these difficulties will be overcome; I think that such a thousands-strong collective as Uralmash and its thousands-strong party organization is up to dealing with these tasks. I hope that Uralmash will be just as much a front-ranker in dealing with many of these as it has been from the very times of the first of our 5-year periods in production of domestic-built heavy machine-building.

[Fadeyev] I would like to say something in this respect about the economy of the People's Republic of Hungary, with regard to the fact that I have a note asking the question, put in the form of what are the main reasons for and what is the essence of Hungary's problems with economic development. You'll recall, comrades, if you followed the events in Hungary, that at the end of the 1970's and at the start of the 1980's a new economic reform in Hungary produced positive results, National income started to rise in Hungary, the state budget started to grow, better and interesting industrial enterprises and agricultural cooperatives started functioning, growth in industrial output and agricultural produce increased. Hungary began to settle its debts -- and it must be said that in the 1970's Hungary had an immense debt to the West. Hungarian industry and the economy is designed, as you know, primarily on the basis of market prices, so to speak, and it is the particular nature of Hungarian industry that it is oriented toward the demands of the market. Here, I think, one needs to be very careful to avoid being wrecked upon serious and mighty submerged rocks.

Orientation toward the demands of the market, of course, is very much tied in with selling the output produced by the enterprise. It is here that our Hungarian comrades came up against big problems. This happened because, having made great capital investments in the development of machinery, having bought some new technology from the West and having put in new technological, so to speak, lines, Hungary probably decided that it would be able to live automatically with this, so to speak, luggage, for several years. However, life dictated its harsh laws; Hungarian produce began to become obsolete with the years and today the Hungarian comrades have come up against the fact that their industrial output, Hungarian goods on the world market and agricultural produce fell in price, I repeat, Hungarian ones, fell by approximately 50 percent for some kinds of products. Of course, that is a lot, but it is understandable when goods that industrial enterprises are unable to sell are building up in a country and pay stays at its former level for the workers -- and, incidentally, in recent years it rose steadily in Hungary -- in economic terms, they bought more than they produced. Industry started to become overstocked with finished goods and Hungary started to come up against the problem that hard currency income fell sharply and domestic currency -- the forint -- income also fell sharply. Suffice it to say that in 1984 Hungary suffered a loss of 574 million forints and in 1986 losses were $250 million [as heard].

Many people in Hungary are now thinking and talking about how to put right the situation that has developed. Incidentally, they are also thinking a great deal about joint cooperation with the socialist countries. This is also a method upon which Hungary is counting upon most seriously to resolve its economic problems. Today there are 281 industrial enterprises functioning in Hungary which have obtained the right to decide their own foreign trade policy independently, i.e. they conclude contracts with foreign firms, they purchase raw material and machinery, they dispose of their own hard currency, naturally, deducting some percentage of the hard currency for the State Bank fund, but here you have to keep an eye most attentively on what I was discussing before, that the standard of the machinery, the standard of the technology, the quality of the finished products and of new goods must correspond to the world market if the Hungarian comrades, or any others, want to compete successfully with the Western market. Of course, the Hungarian comrades are now counting most seriously upon expanding ties with the CEMA members countries.

[?Zholkver] Vladimir Ivanovich was talking about the difficulties of Hungarian exports. One reason is still the insufficient quality, and, as we have been talking so much about cooperation with Czechoslovakia, I would just like to cite for you a pronouncement from one of the central organs of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, RUDE PRAVO. It is interesting that it is concerned with questions of our restructuring. This is how the Czechoslovak comrades see one of the particular features of our cooperation in light of our restructuring: The struggle for quality in industrial items, which has been embarked upon in the Soviet Union, is not only of importance within the USSR; it must be understood in time that it also affects Czechoslovakia. The Soviet Union is our major trading partner, and so the qualitative standards of exports to the Soviet Union are particularly important. It should be expected that the demand for Czechoslovak items on the Soviet market will increase. RUDE PRAVO is absolutely right. This concerns consumer goods, too. It has to be confessed that for a very long time our foreign traders only bought the very cheapest items abroad, including in the socialist countries. But then -- and here I can see many women -- I know that the pretty harsh Czechoslovak shoes, the somewhat old-fashioned GDR-made sweaters and coats, and consumer goods from a number of other socialist countries were regarded as being not at all right.

The times when we bought up wholesale such batches, which then ended up in already full warehouses containing poor-quality shoes made by us and items from our light industry, have gone and now a considerable role in making purchases will be played not by foreign trade, but by domestic trade -- and, comrades, today when we were at your party committee here, it was said with much insistence that purchases will be made both of assembly components and of equipment not by some nameless engineer sitting in Stroypromimport somewhere in Moscow, but with the involvement of a direct representative from Uralmash, a technologist, designers, who know exactly what kind of special machine-tools, say from the very same Skoda works, are needed here -- specifically in Uralmash. One more thing, by the way, it is a very great reserve for the development of our economic ties with the socialist countries.

[Charikov] Well, comrades, you can see how one question posed by Yuriy Vasiliyevich set off such a detailed conversation about the roads of development of CEMA member countries, about the situation of individual countries, mutual relations, and, the most important thing, the future of our relations in the process of restructuring. Comrades, I would like to ask if any of you have any more questions about the socialist countries.

[Butkova] I would like to find out about current situation in China.

[Charikov] Excuse me please, you haven't given your name. That is very important for us.

[Butkova] I am Tamara Dmitrovna Butkova, political information officer at the Plastmass works' coatings department.

[Charikov] Thank you. Vladimir Semenovich, over to you.

[Kulikov] I'll try to answer this question briefly. First of all, about what is happening now in China, as the Chinese themselves describe the economic and political changes that are taking place in the country. The Chinese themselves call the phenomenon now unfolding in China the building of socialism with Chinese characteristics, or the Chinese model of socialism. This is something new, both theoretically and in practice. The basis of this model today is planned commodity production, as they say in China. There are three kinds of property now in China: state, collective, and private. Hence, the multiple nature of the Chinese economy and the term plan and commodity socialist production [planovo-tovarnoye sotsialisticheskoye proizvodstvo], a term that I have not come across, at least in our political economics textbooks. So, something new. Basic fixed assets remain the property of the state -- the works, the land -- while conduct of the business is entirely in the hands of the enterprise and individual families in the countryside.

Here too various unconventional forms of economic management are permitted -- sometimes difficult to align with the theory of socialism -- in the form of stock exchanges, labor markets, competition between enterprises, the bankruptcy of enterprises, that is, all of these kinds of economic mechanisms happen in China and are much written about in the Chinese press. Thus at the present stage of the reforms, industrial enterprises, trade, transport and services have turned into relatively independent economic units operating on these principles -- self-management and self-financing. In the countryside, by agreement with the state -- and it should be said that in the countryside the land has been given to the peasants and those forms of collective economic management, such as the Chinese communes, that were not viable...the land has been handed over to the peasants and the peasants do their own economic management on this land -- as I said, in contrast, by agreement with the state, the peasant can market his surplus at free prices on the market, and sometimes these surpluses can be quite considerable.

The second particular feature of socialism Chinese-style extends to planning. Here they have three, so to speak, forms of planning: about the first third of the volume is included in the state directive plan -- it makes full provision for resources. The second third, as it were, is the guide planning; this is not backed up by any material resources, but it gives some guarantee of marketing products at fixed prices. Finally, the remainder, and sometimes this is a considerable percentage -- sometimes up to 70 percent -- goes to the so-called market adjustment, which is not backed up, does not give any guarantee of selling the products; that is, here market forces come into play, with gains and losses, and consequently, although it is not planned, it happens -- there is speculation and playing, so to speak, with regard to the market prices and this gives rise to a great variety of problems and difficulties with the building of socialism Chinese-style.

People sometimes compare what is happening in China with the NEP [New Economic Plan], but I'm not going to put on the same level what is happening in China and the NEP, the policy pursued by the Bolshevik Party, as you know, in 1921, following the end of the period of so-called war communism. These are quite specific, as it were, historical situations, and any historical parallels are most dangerous, all the more so for these.

Moreover, the revolution happened in 1949 in China; it embarked upon the socialist road and prior to this there came both experience of 5-year periods and experience of socialist construction and, of course, this kind of reaction to the difficulties that developed is somewhat original. Thus, it is not, of course, NEP, but precisely the building of socialism Chinese-style, and we will stock to what they call it in China.

So you have the ideas of socialism and private property somehow in coexistence, however efficient this system might be. I have been to China many times, in the old times, too, and, of course, the changes are immense. It seems as if the cuntry is on the rise; there is evidence of an improvement in the material situation of many categories of people; the appearance of the towns and villages has changed. The country is leading a generally energetic business life, evident in the fact that the market has become remarkably livelier. Of course, this is a result of the reforms that have been implemented. The very fact that they have succeeded in renouncing the idea of leveling down, or as they say in China, the iron rice bowl, bringing out private initiative, bringing out the enthusiasm of the people and giving them an interest in the results of labor has produced a big economic and, I would say, political effect. There you are. But, on the other hand, and this should also be said, perhaps the reform has given rise to very many problems. The Chinese press is writing a great deal about this at present. These problems are being discussed in China. But what kind of problems are they?

In my view, the majority of the difficulties in Chinese reform are dictated by precisely what I was just talking about, the laws of commodity production and the market, because it is precisely on the market that the dividing line between selling and reselling, speculation and hard currency operations is eroded, and I have formed the personal opinion that this universal enthusiasm for trade and the market is simply overwhelming the Chinese towns. Going sometimes around such a major city as Beijing or Shanghai, whole streets and whole districts are in the grip of the trading fever. The trend toward the acquisition of nonlabor income and the exploitation of other people's work seems dangerous, because China permits the hiring of private labor, both in the town and in the countryside. There are very many private enterprises.

It has to be said that the Chinese press is sounding the alarm over corruption, smuggling, speculation, and other economic crimes. Of course, this is all engendered by market elements, which, it seems to me, are being given too much attention as a factor in this socialism Chinese-style. Well, these dangers are even greater in the countryside. Very much also is being written about this in the Chinese press, because the family contracting introduced in the countryside has, of course, rid the countryside of stagnation and enlivened the market; several years ago the Chinese managed to get rid of the ration card system -- that was, as it were, a great achievement, because until recently many products were rationed. A person whose business takes off, as they say, and gets a large income is a 10,000 yuan family. That's a fairly large sum, and a new term has even arisen -- the ten-thousand peasants. But alongside these ten-thousanders, there are simply poor peasants, and this is written about officially in the Chinese press -- there are 150 million such peasants, and, of course, there is social stratification. There is no doubt that all these problems are worrying the Chinese leadership, and the Chinese newspapers are writing a lot about it.

In meetings with Chinese journalists I have often discussed these matters, and it seems to me that the understanding of the complexity of these problems tell us that these problems will be resolved, probably not without difficulty, but they will be resolved, because, you see, the ultimate aim proclaimed by the Chinese Communist Party has never been revoked: it is building socialism, ultimately building a communist society, and very important ideological work is now being done in China, probably related to the approach of the 13th CPC Congress. Much is now being written and said about the so-called four principles that are inscribed both in the Chinese Constitution and, naturally, in the rules of the CPC, and these principles are now the criteria, so to speak -- patriotism, attitude to the future of socialism in China, defending the socialist path of development in China and defending the dictatorship of the proletariat, defending leadership of the Communist Party and defending Marxism-Leninism and the ideas of Mao Zedong. Those are the four principles, although the elements of the commodity market are, of course, overwhelming China, and that is a fairly serious problem for China.

[Charikov] Right, any more questions?

[Shuboderev] Aleksandr Samuilovich Shuboderev, deputy production department chief. Would you please comment on the state of the economy in Afghanistan? What is its national income and, if you have the figures, its per capita national income?

[Fadeyev] Aleksandr Samuilovich, I hope you don't mind if before I answer your question -- and I haven't forgotten it -- I read out another question which I took with me 3 days ago when I was setting out to come to work here. The letter had come from the city of Andropov and gives a full address with the building and apartment number. It was from one Andrey Vladimirovich Novikov, aged 20, who discussed the events in Afghanistan generally. Recently, he writes, all Soviet propaganda has been saying a great deal about the national reconciliation that is taking place in Afghanistan. For us this is interesting because it radically changes the stereotype of events in Afghanistan that Soviet propaganda has presented up to now: namely, that the war in Afghanistan was portrayed as being some sort of handful of renegades, dushmans, and bandits waging an undeclared war against their own people, while the Soviet internationalist servicemen are protecting -- for some reason protecting appears in quotation marks -- the women and children of Afghanistan from the bandits; and there is not a word about the fact that the so-called dushmans are not just a handful of bandits, but an enormous mass of the Afghan population; nor about the fact that tens of thousands of Afghan families have left Afghanistan and are living in Iran and Pakistan.

That's one point in the letter that I would like to refer to in my reply. Next a second point. Let's look at the history of the origin of the war. As everyone knows, the dushman resistance forces began to receive aid from the West in the forms of weapons and military hardware, the writer of the letter says, only after the Soviet Union moved its troops into Afghanistan. What interference was the primary one? The interference that was secondary is obvious, he concludes.

Well, first of all, to give the factual side of the question -- although it might not exactly be in the right order, so to speak: It directly concerns the start of our internationalist aid to our southern neighbor. Back in 1974, when the PDPA existed and operated underground, there were several party groupings in operation along with the PDPA -- opposition groupings which called themselves parties. Among the most noticeable, together with the PDPA, was the so-called Islamic Party, which chiefly comprised young people at school and students at Afghan higher educational establishments who were against all the positive changes in society -- principally social and cultural changes -- which had been made at the time by both Zaher Shah and Daud.

They were against broad education for the people, against the emancipation of women, and wanted the country and all its legal institutions to be ruled by persons in holy orders, in other words the clergy. They staged several quite serious disturbances, managing to involve a certain segment of the population, and the leaders of the party, in particular the now thriving -- to my great regret -- Golboddin Hekmatyar, then a student at a polytechnic institute, and several other leaders had to flee from justice to neighboring Pakistan. Golboddin, incidentally, fled not only from political prosecution, but also from criminal prosecution, because he had murdered a student who had expressed disagreement with this stand.

So, I repeat, that was a 1974-75: It was still a long way off, as you can see, from the April Revolution that took place in 1978. Having based themselves in neighboring Pakistan, these young people began to knock together groupings of people who had fled Afghanistan for various reasons, including criminals, whom they didn't turn their noses up at or find distasteful. They started to carry out subversion against the then Afghan Government from the territory of Pakistan.

The West somehow always forgets this point, incidentally, in its propaganda, but in point of fact the birth of the Afghan counterrevolution should be dated not from 1979, when we moved our limited contingent of Soviet troops in at the request of the then legitimate Afghan Government, but, I repeat, from 1974-75. It was then that the counterrevolution arose, and it was then that the first bands of dushmans were formed. To substantiate what I have said, I would like to quote from a magazine published monthly in the FRG called BLAETTER FUER DEUTSCHE UND INTERNATIONALE POLITIK. The article was published in the January and February issues of this year and is entitled Low-Intensity Wars -- the U.S. Concept of State Terrorism: Afghanistan. Its author is (Joachim Hippler). I don't know who he is, but he seems to me to be an intelligent and quite sober-minded person. This is what he writes: The CIA began limited operations aimed at destabilizing the Afghan Government even before the limited contingent of Soviet troops was moved into Afghanistan in December 1979. The United States supplied medicines and communications equipment to organizations that were waging a war against their government. What organizations these were I have already told you. At the same time, the CIA provided technical aid enabling the rebels to produce weapons themselves. In the very first days after the limited contingent of Soviet troops had been moved in, the U.S. Government hastily made the decision, I quote, to do everything possible to supply the Islamic rebels with weapons. Those operations were coordinated with Saudi Arabia and Egypt, and you are well aware of the quantity of the American supplies. The CIA basically, of course, doesn't like to boast about the size of that aid, but from time to time the figures do surface, and today the official figure for this aid is put for this year at $630 million. You know that last September the Americans delivered 150 of the latest Stinger missiles -- portable antiaircraft and antihelicopter missiles. Recently, while the seventh round of the Geneva talks was going on in March, as you know, under the aegis of the UN secretary general -- talks on a political settlement of the situation regarding Afghanistan -- they in fact loudly announced that they were supplying the Afghan dushmans with another consignment of 300 Stinger missiles. As you know, there have been cases where the dushmans brought down several aircraft belonging to the Bakhtar Afghan Airline carrying (?civilian) passengers, children, women, and the elderly.

Well, I've gone a little off the subject. As far as our internationalist aid is concerned, we began it in December 1979, and I don't think that in our press we ever concealed what the nature of it was. We are not concealing its nature today, either, and we are ready to end that internationalist aid and withdraw our troops from Afghanistan under certain precise conditions.

We want to receive a guarantee from first and foremost the Americans and from Pakistan that they will cease their interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs, that they will cease providing the dushmans with weapons, that they will cease giving them all other support, including moral support, and that they will shut off their paths of supply to the counterrevolution in Afghanistan -- forces that are not inconsiderable, I would tell you. They number tens of thousands. The Western press gives an approximate figure of 90,000 to 120,000 dushmans under arms in Afghanistan. It's an enormous Army, well armed and, believe me, well trained and well familiar with the locality. Of course in this situation our internationalist aid is the chief, if not the only, guarantee of the preservation of the DRA's integrity and sovereignty.

Now, the question of economic aid. Well, I don't want to go into this in detail, if you don't mind, because it is, of course, sufficiently covered by our press, where many figures are given. But what I could say by way of information is that 65 percent of all of Afghanistan's foreign trade today is with our country. Afghanistan today receives, in terms of dollars, almost $150 million in foreign aid, 94.7 percent of which is from the CEMA countries, including 70.1 percent from the Soviet Union. Many Soviet-Afghan economic, scientific and technological cooperation projects are now operating successfully in Afghanistan. Probably some of the names that have appeared in the press and on the television and radio will mean something to you. I have in mind the Afsotr transport enterprise; the Kamaz transport enterprise in Kabul; the oil tanker road haulage enterprise; the technical aid station in Kabul; the technical aid stations in Pol-e Khomri, Mazar-e Sharif, and Towr Kham; the grain storage depot in Mazar-e Sharif, two bakeries -- one was built in Kabul, as you know, and another was built a few years ago in Mazar-e Sharif with completely up-to-date equipment, and I have visited that enterprise; the fertilizer works again in Mazar-e Sharif; and the now famous house-construction combine in Kabul.

Now a little about national reconciliation. We are now in the 10th week of the process of reconciliation and truce -- two different facts that sometimes are mixed up. The reconciliation is a lengthy process, as you know. The chief points in it were described in our press, so I will not talk in detail about them, but out of the most attractive points, as it were, in the whole program of national reconciliation, I would highlight the following. The terms of national reconciliation provide pardon and release from criminal prosecution for people who, in fact, for all these years, have turned their weapons against their own people and have fought against the people's power, unless of course they have been involved in malicious and bloody crimes: It applies, naturally, to the people who are aware of their own guilt. National reconciliation provides for a broad amnesty: Thousands of people have now been released from gaols with their word of honor to the government and to their people that they will never again take up arms against their own people. The national reconciliation, as you know, permits and even calls upon the opposing sides to set up a Government of National Unity, going as far as a coalition government, comrades. In other words, the members of the opposing groups have the possibility of taking part in a future coalition government. It's another matter that they, on the instructions of Washington I have no doubt, have strongly rejected the idea of national reconciliation, putting forward humiliating and unacceptable conditions to the PDPA. But the chief aim of national reconciliation, the supreme aim, as it were, is to end the bloodshed, to end the fratricidal war -- that same war that our listener from the city of Andropov has for some reason called a civil war.

But there's another thing, too. There are today some 2.5 million Afghans living outside their homeland of Afghanistan on the territory of Iran and Pakistan -- people who at different times and for different reasons have left their country. We know that today, as a result of national reconciliation and the call by the party and government for them to return home, thousands of Afghans have already found the opportunity to cross the border, although this is no easy thing, and return to their villages and the homes.

They have been well received: They have been given material assistance and medical aid and have been given work, as far as possible, of course. That, too, is something great -- the reunification of families; and the reunification of the families of those who voluntarily -- and there are more than 10,000 of these, and this number is increasing day by day as we know by the reports in our press, people who had belonged to bands, who were able to take heed of the voice of reason, and who had simply become tired of war -- who voluntarily are coming today to the local committees and bodies of the people's power, laying down their weapons and stating their readiness to build a peaceful life together with the people. That too is a large and great process in Afghanistan.

[Charikov] Thank you, Vladimir Ivanovich. Some more questions, please.

[Shorina] Shorina, an engineer in the main power engineering department. At present the Western press is making a lot of noise about the USSR having occupied Nicaragua, Afghanistan, Mongolia, Poland and the GDR. We all know that. Well, we are not going to talk about Afghanistan, nor about Nicaragua, but how can one explain the presence of our troops in the GDR and Mongolia, and why does our government not proceed to withdraw our troops from there?

[Charikov] Aleksandr Vladimirovich Zholkver will answer your question.

[Zholkver] Well, comrades, I do not think there is any need to ask for an answer to this question among this audience as to why our troops went into Berlin. This is recalled clearly enough by the Treptow Park memorial, which expressed this idea visually: on the one side, a soldier who has cut through a swastika with his sword and, on the other, with a rescued child in his arms. It was this dual mission -- a mission of retribution for Hitlerite aggression and a mission of helping the peoples by liberating them -- that brought the Soviet soldier to Berlin. Now the basis for the presence of Soviet troops in the GDR is the existing agreement between the USSR and the GDR Governments and the membership of our two states in the Warsaw Pact Organization. It is on this basis that Soviet troops are present in certain other Warsaw Pact member countries, say, Hungary and Czechoslovakia. In certain Warsaw Pact Organization countries there are no Soviet troops -- there are none in Bulgaria, none in Romania. These are the agreements that have been reached.

It is another matter how many of these troops there are, how long they are there for and with what weapons. I happened to be working in the GDR when 20,000 Soviet soldiers and 1,000 tanks were withdrawn, and in the presence of Western journalists, too. There is also the question of equipping these troops.

You know that the question has been posed that if agreement is reached on the elimination of intermediate-range missiles in Europe, both Soviet and American, we also shall remove our enhanced range operational-tactical missiles, which are in response to he deployment of the Pershings, all the 108 American Pershings deployed in the FRG. We undertook retaliatory measures -- the installation of enhanced range operational-tactical missiles in the GDR and Czechoslovakia. In agreement with the GDR and Czechoslovakia Governments, and they already have issued the relevant statements, these missiles will be withdrawn just a soon as an agreement is reached on intermediate-range missiles. Moreover, our government -- and this was first announced in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement -- is prepared to embark upon solving the shorter-range missiles question immediately after that. We also are prepared not simply to withdraw, but to eliminate these missiles. This question is therefore acquiring truly great topicality now. We are ready to resolve this question.

Incidentally, the Soviet Union's initiative -- even prior to the latest statement on intermediate-range missiles -- also was aimed at reducing conventional weapons.

We also must speak about the other side and note that at present, according to official American data for the end of 1986, the United States had a total of 1,500 military bases and installations, where 500,000 American soldiers are stationed in 32 countries. Look how painfully the Americans immediately react when the question is raised not necessarily of eliminating them, but even of making some reduction in the number of these bases. The Spanish are asking this question, and they cannot get a decision. Similarly, this question has been under discussion now in Turkey; after Weinberger's visit to Spain he went on to Turkey and, on the contrary, the validity of the agreement on the presence of U.S. bases in Turkey and on the stationing there of the U.S. Air Force and Navy, too, was extended there. [passage omitted]

[Charikov] If you please, are there any more questions from the floor?

[Question] I'm from workshop No 50 at Uralmash. This is my question. We have been talking about intermediate-range missiles, and the great conflicts we have with the Americans, and so on. But if you recall the time when our missiles were being taken to Cuba, the Americans prohibited (?them from being taken there) and there was such a major conflict that Mikoyan even had to go there, and the conflict was settled all the same. Why did our people allow these intermediate-range missiles to be installed in Europe? That's my question.

[Zholkver] Comrades, first of all, it is not by accident that you have drawn an analogy here with the so-called Cuban missile crisis. Indeed, the situation at that time was so serious that certain historians now think that the world was balancing on the brink of nuclear war. Well, the situation is now even more complicated: Even more nuclear weapons have been accumulated, they have become even more complex and their delivery vehicles have become even more sophisticated.

[Unidentified interjection] Quite right.

[Zholkver] Most sophisticated, I would say. Thus, under present conditions, it is doubly dangerous to balance on the brink of war. At that time, you know, it took both sides to display some kind of restraint in order to pull back from the threshold of death. So it would be doubly dangerous to move toward that under present conditions.

But you are correct in this respect: The thing is that this process did not take place over one brief period. I mentioned the 108 Pershings in the FRG. They were not brought in all at once and, incidentally, installation of cruise missiles is still continuing today, and now the Belgians, for example, are very glad that it seems that an agreement on the elimination of the missiles is being contemplated, and they will not need to install these American cruise missiles, which they agreed to in principle via NATO, on the designated sites near Florennes, near the town. So here it is a question of U.S. pressure on the NATO countries to get them to agree to this deployment indeed being very great, but there is another aspect to the problem.

In those years I was working, as it happens, in the FRG, when they were preparing for this, and I travelled there later, and to other countries in Western Europe....I have to say that somewhere -- take, for example, the Schmidt doctrine, the then chancellor of the FRG -- this so-called two-track decision was made, that is, on the one hand, they give the go-ahead for the deployment of these missiles, but, on the other, they demand that talks be continued with the Soviet Union on a whole range of aspects, first and foremost on the reduction of strategic weapons. If you like, the Americans bought the West Europeans' agreement to, as they said, allowing us to install these missiles and in exchange we nonetheless will pledge ourselves to continue the talks with the Soviet Union on reduction of strategic weapons. The Americans have not implemented the second half of this two-track decision; they have not fulfilled it.

This is why I'm saying all this: On the one hand to demonstrate that the Soviet Union has made every effort to prevent such a dangerous turn of events. The United States, the U.S. Administration, has acted in the opposite direction, first and foremost defending the interests of the American military-industrial complex. That is how the situation developed.

How must this problem be solved today? Of course, not by looking backward, neither to the events of 1979, nor to the events of 1960's regarding Cuba, but by looking ahead. How can this matter be resolved? The opportunity of solving the problem of eliminating the intermediate-range missiles has now arisen, but this in no way removes, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said in his 28 February statement, the need to resolve the matter of limitation of strategic weapons, of eliminating the military potential that has been stockpiled altogether and, of course, of preventing the penetration of weapons into space. This is all the more topical now, as this week is the fourth anniversary of Reagan's speech in London, where he set out the Star Wars program. During those years the unrealistic nature, on the one hand, of this program has become perfectly clear, and, on the other, its danger. We hope that Washington will heed the warnings of the Soviet Union and of U.S. scientists themselves.

[Kulikov] I would like to illustrate the difference in the approaches of the Soviet Union and the United States to the disarmament question overall and to the elimination of intermediate-range missiles specifically. I would like to quote to you the words of a fairly curious person, a former chief of staff of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. His name is (Pat Holt). This is how he described Reagan's position at the present time, he says, literally, the following: the President -- meaning Reagan -- does not accept Gorbachev's proposal. This looks as if you are being paid so that you might not do something that should not be done. One more feature that we should not forget. This is that for a very long time the Pentagon, the military department of the United States, has fostered and nurtured the idea, and adopted as doctrine the possibility of a limited nuclear war. They have not renounced it yet, and it would seem that they have no intention of renouncing the doctrine of the limited nuclear war. I would like to recall that the first, as it were, intermediate-range missile, if you like, strike vehicle was the B-29 bomber carrying nuclear weapons. These bombers appeared on British airfields immediately after the end of World War II. On the purely military level, the attainment of an agreement eliminating intermediate-range missiles has set a good example, but, on the other hand, it would get rid of the temptation to make a nuclear first-strike, a warning strike, or whatever; it would exclude the possibility of a limited nuclear war. That is one other meaning of our step directed toward attaining an agreement eliminating intermediate-range missiles.

[Charikov] Right. Comrades, are there any more questions from the floor? Well, in that case, allow me to thank you for your attention. [applause] Do write to us, please, with questions, to Moscow radio, International Situation: Questions and Answers. All the best.

TASS COMMENTS ON REAGAN SPEECH TO EXECUTIVES

LD310824 Moscow TASS in English 0712 GMT 31 Mar 87

[Text] Washington March 31 TASS -- By TASS correspondent Igor Ignatiyev:

On Monday President Reagan addressed high-ranking executives. The remarks by the President addressed to the executive forum were described by an official spokesman as a summary of the current adminstration's "agenda" for the remaining two years of Reagan's Presidency.

By his remarks, the AP agency stressed, Reagan was trying to demonstrate that his administration was not paralyzed by the Iran-contras scandal. Thus the President was trying to claim in particular that his administration's "accomplishments" in foreign relations had been "profound." Reagan listed among such "accomplishments" first and foremost the unprecedented build-up of the U.S. military power under the current administration, which, as he said, had shown that Washington was "willing to negotiate genuine arms reduction."

Yet it is precisely the massive programme started by the White House for a "rearmament of America", which is the impediment in the way to progress towards a reduction and limitation of nuclear arsenals. It is for the sake of creating and deploying ever new systems of mass destruction weapons that the U.S. Administration has flouted the SALT-2 treaty, is continuing its effort to torpedo the ABM Treaty which prevents it from implementing the plans to militarise outer space.

It is not accidental that the President deemed it necessary to stress that the USA must go forward with the Strategic Defence Initiative. "SDI is not now, nor will I ever permit it to become a mere bargaining chip." It is known that as a result of this intransigence and reluctance of the USA to agree to compromises that a history-making opportunity has already been missed at Reykjavik to conclude a Soviet-American agreement on the limitation of nuclear weapons.

The U.S. chief executive was trying to justify the work currently under way in the USA within the framework of the "Star Wars" programme by the excuse that he would be powerless to prevent a massive loss of American life, if at least a single missile were launched against the United States.

Reagan mentioned another great issue before the administration in foreign affairs: the "cause of liberty in Central America." The question is clear here, he claimed, it is either communism or freedom.

The President reaffirmed the commitment of the White House to further support for the contra gangs which are responsible for the killings of innocent peaceful civilians, subversion and economic sabotage. The President listed among the services done by his administration that "not one inch of territory has fallen to the Soviets. From Afghanistan to Nicaragua, today the guerrillas fight not for communism, but for freedom," the President said pompously. He cited as an example of such a "freedom American-style" Grenada, where the U.S. expeditionary corps armed to the teeth overthrew, in violation of all norms of international law, the legitimate government of Maurice Bishop and planted in that country by force of arms a dictatorial regime of pro-American puppets.

In the field of home policy the U.S. chief executive also failed to offer any new remedies and only listed the aims which his administration was unsuccessfully trying to achieve in the past years.

PRAVDA ON 'EXAGGERATED' USSR MILITARY POWER

PM301028 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Mar 87 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Gan report: "Lies, With a Hidden Purpose: The Pentagon Brochure on the 'Soviet Threat'"]

[Text] Washington, 26 Mar -- In the opinion of high-ranking Pentagon officials, Americans should constantly "sense a threat to their security," since there is no other way of making them shell out for military programs. "Every time we create the impression that we and the Soviet Union are beginning to cooperate and to moderate our rivalry," U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense Perle explained, "we undermine that sense of threat."

This is a cynical "philosophy." That does not worry its "founders" -- the propaganda falsification production line is working at a crazy speed, bringing to the surface more and more heaps of terrifying anti-Soviet fabrications.

"Soviet Military Power" -- that is the title of a brochure just published by the Pentagon for the sixth time during the Reagan administration's rule. Like all its five predecessors, it is not simply an apology for unrestrained militarism. It is probably the quintessence of hatred of the Soviet Union.

The authors themselves cannot be called paranoid. They would like to make their fellow citizens paranoid, instilling fear into them with every line. "As free people, we should understand that the Soviet political system -- a system which, the Soviet proclaim, will triumph over ours -- is nurturing the growth of military might... The Soviet Union continues to seek world domination... In domestic policy the CPSU's main goal is to restore the weakened Soviet economy and lay the foundations for future military expansion... The main goal of Soviet strategy in the arms control sphere is to establish control over the rate of military modernization in the West, and also to block specific programs, such as the 'Strategic Defense Initiative' (SDI) and other American military modernization plans...".

Basically the entire brochure consists of such sentences, alternating with "indicators" which are exaggerated to an inconceivable size relating to Soviet defense spending and the numerical strength and equipment of Soviet armed forces.

These "indicators," which are plucked out of the air and are constantly being exposed, stubbornly migrate from one Pentagon work to another. That is understandable: Without them the falsifiers and slanderers would soon overtax themselves in their attempt to prove the "mortal threat from the Soviets."

The Pentagonites have concocted a whole 147 pages of anti-Soviet horror stories -- without begrudging the costly, glossy paper -- while assigning only 14 to the "American response" to Moscow's "global machinations." In this section the United States is, naturally, represented as a lamb to the slaughter. All its thoughts and concerns are only of peace and security, of "rebuffing the USSR's aggressive plans." The emphasis is above all on the "Star Wars" program, which, without a trade of embarrassment, is called "the hope for a significantly more stable and secure strategic order." [paragraph continues]

The conclusion -- "maintaining a strong military potential in the long term requires us to finance an adequate defense program every year."

The publication of the Pentagon brochure is no accident. The "budget battle" between the administration and Congress is becoming fiercer, and is waged mainly over the request for huge appropriations for the war department. The White House and Pentagon are seriously alarmed by the broad opposition on Capitol Hill to the plans to step up work on SDI. Incidentally, Reagan marked the fourth anniversary of that adventurist program with a special statement in which he entreats the Congress not to lessen its support for "Star Wars."

There is also another very important feature clearly present in the calculations of those who are now orchestrating the violent upsurge of anti-Sovietism. This is the real opportunity which has emerged for achieving a USSR-U.S. agreement on Euromissiles. In the face of the very broad public support for such an agreement, the opponents of any accords with the USSR are afraid to block it straight out, preferring to operate by stealth.

## Bogachev on 'Deliberate Lies'

LD301936 Moscow TASS in English 1913 GMT 30 Mar 87

["Incorrigible Weinberger" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow March 30 TASS -- TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev:

If we are to believe U.S. Secretary of Defence Caspar Weinberger, in the past six years rough military parity between the USSR and the U.S., which had existed before Reagan came to the White House, has turned into the Soviet Union's huge superiority in virtually every component of the military potential with the exception of the number of large surface ships.

It follows from the recent statements of the Pentagon chief at the press conference in Washington, devoted to the publication of the latest propaganda booklet "Soviet Military Power," tht the United States, having spent more than one trillion dollars for military purposes between 1981 and 1986, has lost parity with the Soviet Union in the strategic forces and is now inferior to it in intercontinental ballistic missiles and submarine-launched ballistic missiles in the ration of 1 to 4!

When the SALT-2 Soviet-American treaty was being readied for signature in 1979, the balance of strategic forces between the sides was carefully checked by leading experts. A supplement to the treaty, signed by the leaders of the two countries, noted that the Soviet Union had roughly 2,500 strategic delivery vehicles (intercontinental ballistic missiles, submarine-launched ballistic missiles and heavy bombers) and the United States about 2,300.

But what has happened to the American strategic forces? Even the Pentagon admits that the total numerical strength of the Soviet ICBMs, SLBMs and strategic bombers has not increased since 1979. Has the Reagan administration spent one trillion dollars just to destroy the American strategic forces, cutting them back by three-fourths?

Nothing of the sort. Late last year the Reagan administration exceeded the limits set by the SALT-2 treaty on bombers with cruise missiles, thus derailing that treaty. Old submarines with Polaris and Poseidon missiles were replaced with missile-carrying submarines of the Ohio type. A few outdated Titan ICBMs were dismantled and replaced with 10 MX ICBMs carrying 10 warheads each. About 70 B-52 bombers were modified into refuelling planes.

The modernization of the U.S. strategic force, naturally, has not detracted from its potential. At present the U.S. has in its strategic arms arsenal 2,208 delivery vehicles against the Soviet Union's 2,408. However, the United States has 50 per cent more nuclear warheads on its strategic delivery vehicles than the USSR has.

The statement of the Pentagon chief about the Soviet Union's quadruple superiority over the U.S. in strategic missiles is neither a slip nor an inaccuracy but a deliberate lie.

The Pentagon's allegations of a U.S. "lag" in the military filed are intended to justify the unprecedented programmes of the U.S. buildup of weapons of mass annihilation and disguise the true scope of the arms race whipped up by the United States.

U.S. RECEIVES WARSAW PACT MEETING DOCUMENTS

LD310633 Moscow TASS in English 0622 GMT 31 Mar 87

[Text] Washington March 31 TASS -- The charge d'affaires of the USSR to the United States visited the U.S. State Department on March 30 and officially handed over the documents of the foreign ministers' committee session of the Warsaw Treaty member states held in Moscow on March 24-25, 1987. These included the communique, the statement "For Furthering the CSCE Process and Bringing the Vienna Followup Meeting to a Successful Outcome" and the "Statement by the Warsaw Treaty Member States on the Issue of a Ban on Chemical Weapons".

It was emphasized that the documents adopted at the foreign ministers' committee session demonstrated the Warsaw Treaty member states' persistent efforts aimed at halting the arms race, reducing and eliminating nuclear weapons, preventing space militarization, abolishing chemical weapons and the industrial base for their production, drastic reduction in the armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe.

These efforts are an expression of the allied socialist states' unwavering and principled course of establishing an all-embracing system of international security, creating a nuclear-free and non-violent world.

FEDONIN COMMENTS ON NEW U.S. PACIFIC COMMAND

LD301406 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 30 Mar 87

[Text] Washington has announced the setting up of a U.S. Pacific Command. It is a reorganization of the former Western Command. The Pentagon describes this step as a reorganization aimed at enhancing the combat efficiency of U.S. Armed Forces in the region. At the microphone is our commentator, Aleksandr Fedonin:

The Pacific was long ago proclaimed a vital zone of U.S. interests. That is why its waters are furrowed round the clock by aircraft carriers of the 7th Fleet. A chain of U.S. military bases stretches across the island of Guam, Japan, and South Korea. The bases at Clark Field and Subic Bay, both in the Philippines, are known, and evidently for good reason, as the pearl of this sinister garland hung by the Pentagon. The press in the Philippines does not exclude the possibility that there may be nuclear weapons on these military sites, so it is quite probable that the Pentagon's garland may turn out to have a nuclear filling.

Every year the Pentagon carries out naval exercises in the Pacific, exercises in which its Asian allies, on whose territory U.S. military installations are, as a rule, situated, take part. Now their personnel, and U.S. units that are stationed there, come under the newly created Pacific Command. This is a way of directly associating the army units with the operations of the naval forces: in other words, of expanding the scale of U.S. military activity in Asia and the Pacific. To justify such actions, the thesis of a Soviet threat is pressed into service. One cannot say that the Pentagon's propaganda campaign is not achieving its object. In the political circles of some of the countries of that vast region, the admonitions and intimidations wafting in from across the ocean are sometimes taken seriously. The attempts to call black white look pretty clumsy, especially now that the Soviet initiatives, in particular the proposal to cut mutual military activity in the Pacific, have found a wide response in the countries of Asia and the Pacific.

## AKHROMEYEV WELCOMES MONGOLIAN CHIEF OF STAFF

PM301515 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Mar 87 Second Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "On an Official Visit"]

[Text] Lieutenant General Sh. Jadambaa, first deputy defense minister of the Mongolian People's Republic and chief of the General Staff of the Mongolian People's Republic Armed Forces, arrived in the Soviet Union 27 March on an official friendly visit at the invitation of Marshal of Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, USSR first deputy defense minister and chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces.

The guest from Mongolia was met at the capital's Sheremetyevo Airport by Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, Colonel General G.F. Krivosheyev, Lt Gen Ye.A. Yevstigneyev, Col Gen of Aviation V.Ye. Pankin, Lt Gen G.A. Borisov, and other generals and officers of the Soviet Armed Forces.

Minister Plenipotentiary (Ts. Gombosuren), counselor at the Mongolian Embassy in the USSR, and Major General (R. Guchin-ish), military and air attache at the Mongolian Embassy in the Soviet Union, were also among the welcoming party.

An honor guard was formed at the airport in honor of the high-ranking guest. Lt Gen Sh. Jadambaa received the report by the honor guard commander and inspected the formation of Soviet servicemen.

### Sokolov Receives Jadambaa

PM301035 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 Mar 87 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "On an Official Visit"]

[Text] On 28 March Marshal of the Soviet Union S.L. Sokolov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, received Lieutenant General Sh. Jadambaa, chief of the General Staff of the Mongolian Armed Forces and Mongolian People's Republic [MPR] first deputy defense minister, who is in the Soviet Union on an official friendly visit. There was a friendly conversation on questions of mutual interest. Taking part in the talk were: On the Soviet side, Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces and USSR first deputy defense minister, and on the Mongolian side T. Gurbadam, MPR ambassador to the USSR.

On the same day a meeting took place between Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev and Lt Gen Sh. Jadambaa.

The guests from Mongolia laid wreaths at the V.I. Lenin Mausoleum and the Tomb of the Unknown Warrior at the Kremlin wall.

## MOSCOW KOREAN COMMENTATOR VIEWS 'TEAM SPIRIT'

SK280554 Moscow International Service in Korean 1130 GMT 26 Mar 87

[Talk by station commentator (Bleskov)]

[Text] For more than 10 years, spring has been a season during which the situation is dangerously aggravated on the Korean peninsula.

This year is no exception. A U.S.-South Korean joint military exercise has been taking place for the past 2 months in South Korea. In addition to the U.S. troops constantly stationed in South Korea to participate in the war conspiracy, units of rapid deployment armed forces have been mobilized from Japan, the Philippines, Hawaii, and California. The total number of participants in the military exercise exceeds 200,000. Aircraft carriers of the U.S. 7th Fleet have massed at the site of the exercise.

This assemblage of armed forces at one of the flashpoints of Asia is a dangerous provocative act. The dangerous nature of the "Team Spirit-87" is most clearly manifested in the scenario according to which a war conspiracy takes place. According to a report by a Japanese publication, operational techniques of Navy, Air Force, and Marine units will be tested over the course of the exercise, and tank units will break through the defenses of a mock enemy. A Marine landing exercise is being staged in an area that is topographically similar to the coast of the DPRK.

Also, the ongoing "Team Spirit" military exercise is aggravating the strained situation because a nuclear attack exercise is staged over the exercise. Hundreds of nuclear combat weapons are stockpiled in South Korea. Furthermore, the U.S. 7th Fleet currently massed near the coast of the DPRK has nuclear offensive capabilities. All these facts cannot but arouse apprehension from the people in this area of Asia.

The Asian-African People's Unity Organization expressed apprehension in connection with the "Team-Spirit-87" military exercise and noted that it aggravates military tension in the entire region. In its statement, the Asian Buddhists pointed out that the military exercise runs counter to the aspirations of peace-loving forces to live peacefully and safely. Bitterly denouncing the perpetration of militarisitic provocations in South Korea, publications of Asian socialist countries noted that the exercise exposes the aggressive nature of the U.S. line toward Asia and the Pacific. Responding to the U.S.-South Korean military exercise, the PRC noted that the exercise notably complicates the possibility for peaceful dialogue between the North and the South.

Protests against the war conspiracy have increased. The people of this region want not to live amid an atmosphere of war frenzy, but an atmosphere of peace and cooperation.

## CORRECTION TO COMMENTATOR ASSESSES DPRK-S. KOREA DIALOGUE

The following correction pertains to the item headlined "Commentator Assesses DPRK-S. Korea Dialogue," published in the 20 March Soviet Union DAILY REPORT on page C 1, paragraph two, line one:

...Seoul's reply to Pyongyang's initiative itself is not bad. [Word indistinct] the South Korean [word indistinct] have refused the DPRK proposals while describing them as maneuvers for instigation.... (rewording)

## DRA PROTESTS TO PAKISTAN ABOUT ATTACKS

LD270534 Moscow TASS in English 1959 GMT 26 Mar 87

[Text] Kabul March 26 TASS -- The Afghan Government today declared a protest to Pakistan since several Afghan populated localities and military posts in border areas have repeatedly come under fire from Pakistani territory lately.

The villages of Pir Kowti and Mitaran [as received] were subjected to fire daily between February 20 and 24, the border post Barikowt was fired at on March 8, the Bayanheil [as received] post came under fire four times on March 10 through 16, and the populated locality Khas Konar was fired at on March 16.

Pakistan's charge d'affaires ad interim, who was summoned to the Afghan Foreign Ministry, was also told of the utterly groundless nature of the charges that Afghan Armed Forces had violated the Pakistani frontier on March 18 and 23.

The Pakistani representative's attention was drawn to the fact that such false accusations only helped to exacerbate tension on the border.

## DRA PROTESTS IRANIAN VIOLATION OF AIRSPACE

LD281926 Moscow TASS in English 1757 GMT 28 Mar 87

[Text] Kabul March 28 TASS -- The Foreign Ministry of Afghanistan made a protest to the Iranian charge d'affaires over the violations of the DRA's air space by the Iranian Air Force. The note says that despite the demands of the Afghan side for an end to the provocations, Iran continues violating Afghanistan's national sovereignty. Thus, on March 25 two Iranian Air Force Planes violated DRA's air space in Robat-e Ja'li area in Nimruz Province.

The protest statement notes that such actions by Iran constitute a violation of generally accepted norms of international law, run counter to the interests of the Afghan and Iranian peoples and are detrimental to the relations between the two neighbour countries.

## DRA'S WAKIL SENDS LETTER ON REFUGEE PROBLEM

LD270540 Moscow TASS in English 2035 GMT 26 Mar 87

[Text] Kabul March 26 TASS -- Afghan Foreign Minister 'Abdol Wakil has called U.N. Secretary-general Javier Perez de Cuellar's attention to the inadmissibility of Iranian and Pakistani authorities erecting artificial obstacles to the return to Afghanistan by refugees.

In a message carried by BAKHTAR news agency today, he said many Afghan emigrants wishing to return home had lately not only been detained by Iranian and Pakistani authorities and Afghan armed anti-government groups cooperating with them and but also tortured.

Some of the refugees had been killed, Wakil said.

He added that the Pakistani side's statement, which had beeen circulated at the United Nations, grossly distorted facts concerning the position of refugees.

It falsely accused Democratic Afghanistan of raising the issue for purely propaganda purposes but failed to give a positive response to a request by the Afghan government for charter flights to be organized for those willing to return to Afghanistan, Wakil wrote.

In the meantime, many Afghans who had found themselves abroad were asking Afghanistan's diplomatic missions and consular offices for assistance with returning to the homeland and such assistance was being invariably granted to them, the message said.

Other Afghan emigrants, it added, were requesting the assistance of the Supreme Extraordinary Commission for National Reconciliation in Afghanistan through their relatives in this country.

The message stressed the need for active cooperation between the U.N. High Commission's Office for Refugees and Afghan authorities to ensure the legitimate rights of refugees to return home.

The Afghan foreign minister expressed the hope that the U.N. secretary-general would also use his influence to solve the problem of an unimpeded return to their homeland by refugees, with account taken of the high importance of that problem to a political settlement of the situation regarding Afghanistan.

U.S. 'HINDRANCE' IN DRA SETTLEMENT CLAIMED

LD261817 Moscow TASS in English 1742 GMT 26 Mar 87

[Text] Moscow March 26 TASS -- TASS news analyst Valeriy Vavilov writes:

Lies have long become part of the array of means being used by Washington, its allies and voluntary assistants to hinder the process of a political settlement of the Afghanistan situation.

This is evidenced once again by assertions being circulated in some places in the West and in Islamabad that aircraft of the Afghan Air Force alledgedly raided Pakistan recently.

It is significant that malicious remarks about the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan (DRA) become particularly vociferous every time when prospects for a political resolution of the protracted conflict in the region emerge.

This is how it was previously, this is how it is now.

It must be recalled that at the recently-concluded second stage of the seventh round of the Pakistani-Afghan talks in Geneva, there began to emerge positive changes, real and specific progress which was opening the way for a political settlement.

The foes of a settlement immediately take steps to complicate the situation and to heighten tension.

It is precisely these goals that are being served by inventions concerning the DRA, by the current discussions in U.S. Congress on the appropriation of new billions of dollars to Pakistan in military and economic aid, by promises to supply Islamabad with the newest arms, and by the recent provocative "Day of Afghanistan".

By announcing the 'Day of Afghanistan', the United States President again confirmed his intention to go on supporting the counterrevolutionaries.

The "support" is known to have manifested itself in the allocation of 630 million dollars for the Afghan extremist groups this year alone and in the provision of additional 300 Stinger anti-aircraft missiles for them.

Inventions about Afghan air raids on Pakistan have now been resorted to.

Those mendacious assertions have been authoritatively and categorically refuted by the DRA's Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Afghan news agency BAKHTAR.

It is quite clear that what is needed for the speediest political settlement of the Afghanistan situation is real desire for settlement, a businesslike approach to the problem, and readiness for flexibility and compromises, and not U.S. weapons for the counterrevolutionaries, Stinger missiles, or insinuations and lies.

What is needed is termination and guaranteed non-resumption of interference in the internal affairs of sovereign Afghanistan.

This is precisely what is being demanded by both the Afghan and international public!

ASSISTANT TO ENVOY IN KABUL NOTES 'TROOPS WEARY'

WA311500 Kuwait AL-MUTJAMA' in Arabic 10 Mar 87 p 14

[Text] Brig Muhammad Sirwar Shinwari, an officer in the Afghan Army who joined the Mujahideen recently, discovered the situation of the Russian forces in Afghanistan through his acquaintance with Russian officers working in Afghanistan during his service in the Afghan Armed Forces. (M.S. Junyatov), a deputy to the Russian ambassador in Kabul, told him that the Soviet forces had become weary. He said that the reports which were going to the Kremlin about the war situation in Afghanistan had affirmed that it was extremely distressing and that all of the reports to the Kremlin were proposing that the war be ended.

PAPER ON PLIGHT OF VETERANS OF AFGHANISTAN

AU250918 Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAINA in Ukrainian 17 Mar 87 p 4

[Article by Major O. Morozov, city of Kiev: "Someone Else's Pain Hurts, Too -- They Resisted the Dushmans, but Succumbed to Callousness"]

[Text] The short but suggestive term, "the Afghans," has become, not at once but firmly, part of our vocabulary. Only seldom, perhaps on festive occasions, do we call them internationalists, and in our reports we write: "He served in the restricted contingent of Soviet troops in Afghanistan, discharged his internationalist duty..."

Scorched by a warm eastern wind and by a war, the faces of those boys leave an impression for a long time, if not forever. The suntan disappears, but the injuries -- do they heal? Well, if not the physical ones, then mental ones remained.

What has been seen there, beyond the high ranges of the Hindukush, has changed the boyish ideas of life. And the point is not that they were destined, in one way or another, to smell gun powder and to experience the bitter ordeal to the end. What matters is something else. They have seen a different life, life not embellished by posters of Western propaganda. Anyhow, who are they, those soldiers-internalists of yesterday, and workers, kolkhoz peasants, and students today? What distinguishes them from their coevals?

Frequently we meet those who have served in the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan [DRA] and who continue to wear uniforms. Army life is for them a routine, a military job, a trade.

For Serhiy Nuzhnenko, Yuriy Pechnikov, Vitaliy Pinchuk, and many others of their comrades in arms, the Army is an episode in their lives, a recollection. They recall their service in Afghanistan even in their dreams. And their present conditions and acts have, to a large extent, been conditioned by the period of life which has shaped their best features and had promoted honesty and opennes to the rank of civil virtues.

Poverty, misery, and bloody retributions dispensed to the peaceful inhabitants of highland kishlaks [villages] by the counterrevolutionaries or, more exactly, the bandits aroused justified fury, and the death of comrades caused bitter sadness...But they have never been revengeful, have never been vainglorious. And even today one does see them wearing their government decorations daily. They do not pretend to share the peerage with veterans of the Great Patriotic War, do not boast about their heroism among their coevals. Indeed, they are like the people traveling with them early in the morning by overcrowded urban buses and rushing to plant gates. They resemble the latter, but are different. The present generation is trying to equal them and no one else, they are for use the model of a contemporary hero. The Gold Stars on the chest of Valeriy Hrinchak, Viktor Kapshuk or Ruslan Aushev is for the present young generation like a torch. Equally shining are also the orders and combat medals held -- unfortunately, worn seldom -- by Yuriy Sruncha, Olena Hovorova, Anatoliy Zherebets, and Yuriy Pechnikov. What matters, however, is not the radiance of the silver; it is our treatment of those who have won these awards and who are able to supplement them with the warmth of their romantic destinies, who are able to kindle with their spark patriotic flames in the souls of their coevals and of little boys -- the future defenders of the homeland.

The clubs of soldiers-internationalists are now taking the first, but still very timid steps. They still lack organization and a clear-cut program, they do not always meet with support on the part of Komsomol organizations, although their striving to realize themselves and their experience in life with a benefit for the younger generation deserves respect and esteem.

Serhiy Nuzhnenko complains about the slow progress made in setting up such a club at his own "Leninska Kuznya" plant.

"I have just been in Podol District," he said. "A housing operation office there has set up a club for ex-servicemen. I wanted to see their work experience, but a rayon Komsomol committee secretary happened to attend their meeting, and most probably for this reason they mostly discussed their personal troubles, painful problems."

Serhiy told us what he heard with evident reluctance. Their problems, for the most part, happened to be the same, concerning housing and living conditions. One of the ex-servicemen has joined the waiting list for a dwelling more than 7 years long. And he has two children in a room chilled through thin walls. Another one complained about the problems in finding a job. Yes, employers invite them, welcome them with a smile, but as soon as they learn that the prospective employee is an "Afghan," they immediately change the tone and start looking for an excuse, which is always available. The thing is that these young men are entitled to certain privileges which imply an additional trouble for the leadership.

Indeed, this is a sore spot. And quite a few young people who served in the DRA bring it forward. But it is not the most important point for them. For the most part, they are modest, patient and, as they say, positive boys. It is strange that some people are unable to resist the pressure of a grafter, and refuse a benefit to those who served in Afghanistan while the latter, in line with our laws, are entitled to certain privileges. They are entitled to, but do all of them enjoy these privileges?

The students and teaching staff of the Kiev T.H. Shevchenko State University know that blond and energetic young woman. They know her as an active public figure, and have heard that she was distinguished with a combat medal. But how many of them have heard about her work in the DRA? What is great and important cannot be said in a few words. Let me give just a few details. Olena arrived in the DRA with the first troop trains. Nurse Hovorova spent more than a month or 2 working in a tent hospital which did not yet have organized services. She also happened to cry over a wounded soldier, being unable to help him. But she continued her very necessary work, and looked forward to a meeting with her relatives, with the homeland. And the meeting took place...

In the Reception Commission of the Kiev Medical Institute, she was received by a chubby and red-faced man. As it turned out later on, that man had brought about a sharp turn in her destiny. The meeting with that man did not overshadow the joy of returning home, but it would be much better if there were in our lives fewer people of this kind, people who are good at the first glance, but who are really callous and heartless. She was not admitted to the medical institute, although she had attended a secondary medical school and practical work in a field hospital in Afghanistan. And Olena will remember for a long time what she was told: "You went abroad to earn money." Like her friend Olena Plakushcha, who performed surgery in a helicopter under the dushmans' fire, Olena Hovorova will not forget the trials she had to go through to register in her native city.

These are not complaints, but moments of relevation... Other people are able to "bombard" offices under any pretext and to snatch what they think they are entitled to. But the "Afghans" are different.

... The young men remember the martial music played by the regimental band for a military column heading for the mountains, remember letters from close friends and relatives. The young women more vividly remember barefooted Afghan children whose sad eyes followed the column of the "Shuravi" who brought them bread, drugs, and kind smiles.

Yes, they have things to remember and to be proud of, but also we can take pride in them. These people live among us and work honestly. And they are always prepared to respond to anyone's mishap. After all, someone else's pain hurts them, too. And there is no need to prove that. The only thing that must not be permitted is to forget their exploit and to be heartless with regard to them, because the feat of their generation must not be forgotten.

TASS NOTES PAKISTAN-U.S. TIES 'FUEL' ARMS RACE

LD261352 Moscow TASS in English 1013 GMT 29 Mar 87

[Text] New Delhi March 29 TASS -- Prime Minister Mohammad Khan Junejo of Pakistan has disclosed that the Islamabad administration is holding talks with the U.S. military-industrial complex to buy newest American radars and other military hardware for the Pakistani Army and Air Force.

Speaking in the city of Rawalpindi, he attempted to justify that increasingly strong militarist bonds between Islamabad and Washington will allegations about an "outside threat" to his country's security, UNI news reported.

The Indian press noted that such allegations were routinely used by the Islamabad administration as an excuse for massive purchases of modern military equipment in the United States by far in excess of Pakistan's defense needs.

The militarist strategy of that country's leaders, said the HINDUSTAN TIMES, among other Indian papers, had aroused legitimate concern in India whose people demanded an end to the arms race which Pakistan was fueling in the region.

TRADE OFFICIAL WARNS MALAYSIA ON IMBALANCE

BK201655 Kuala Lumpur BERITA HARIAN in Malay 14 Mar 87 p 18

[Text] Kuala Lumpur, Friday [13 March] -- The Soviet Union will stop importing all Malaysian commodities if the trade balance between the two countries continues to favor Malaysia. The Malaysian-Soviet trade ratio in the last 5 years has remained at 15:1.

The head of the Soviet Ministry for Foreign Trade, Economy, and Development of Asian Countries, R.A. Savadian [name and title as published], said that that step is possible if the situation is not corrected. In a recent meeting at the Ministry of Trade in Moscow, he commented, "If possible, we do not want to take any economic action against Malaysia. Malaysia should be aware, however, that we can still buy Malaysian products from other countries."

In 1986 alone, the Soviet Union imported Malaysian products worth $160 million while its exports to Malaysia were worth $10 million.

As an early step, he said, the Soviet Union could reduce imports of Malaysian products such as rubber, palm oil, and cacao. He added, "The two countries have traded for a long time, but we still have seen no practical effort by Malaysia to correct the imbalance in its favor." He said that the Malaysian Government has made no real effort to increase its imports from the Soviet Union.

He said that the Soviet Union is dissatisfied with Malaysia's handling of visas. "For example," he said, "our technicians are having problems repairing tractors in Malaysia because of the difficulty in obtaining visas."

Savadian also said that the bidding system is posing a problem to his country. Meanwhile, the deputy chief of foreign economic relations, Boris N. Kolstov [name and title as published], said that the Soviet Union is ready to discuss all aspects of bilateral trade with Malaysia. He added, "We are ready and waiting for Malaysia's decision and action." He said that the Soviet Union has no suspicions of economic problems and has given Malaysia several proposals for consideration. He continued, "Included in the proposals is for Malaysia to assist in several construction projects, review its credit payments, and expand the market for Soviet-made products."

## PRAVDA CITES POLISH JOURNALIST ON RESTRUCTURING

PM271619 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Mar 87 First Edition p 4

[Article by Wieslaw Rogowski, chief editor of the weekly ARGUMENTY, under the rubric "A Foreign Publicist Takes the Floor": "The Banner of Restructuring"]

[Text] Warsaw, March [dateline as published] -- Current events in the Soviet Union are arousing tremendous interest all over the world, and not only on the part of the supporters of socialism. What we are talking about is a turnabout, a sudden change of a revolutionary nature which will release new material, spiritual, and social potential in Soviet society. It is not just a matter of emulating someone or overtaking someone in terms of scientific-technical and economic achievements. It is first and foremost a matter of creating a new social order which will show the world socialism provides the maximum democracy and is by its nature the most democratic system.

If there have been flaws and deviations in its forward development, they, as is known, were not products of its fundamental features, but were due to certain errors of a subjectivist, dogmatic nature.

More democracy today means more socialism. More socialism means more democracy. Transformations reflecting a desire for complete openness in all spheres of life, wider scope in people's power and self-management, the elimination of dogmatism, and the opening to innovative ideas and new social practices -- this, in fact, is the present phase of socialist transformation.

There is something symbolic in the fact that the CPSU made such important political steps at the Central Committee January Plenum in the year of the 70th anniversary of Great October and presented a detailed program of practical changes in the country's life. It was V.I. Lenin who once took it upon himself to tackle the difficult questions of the socialist revolution whose consequences affected the whole world, not just Russia. I believe that today's program for restructuring and acceleration in the Soviet Union will also have major consequences. If, and I believe this will happen, the project is implemented in full, socialism will become infinitely more attractive in the very near future.

If the stagnation had gone on any longer Soviet society would have suffered far greater losses. I emphasize Soviet people's responsibility since the movement forward is occurring in th new-against-old struggle not only between socialism and capitalism, but within socialist society itself. This is confirmed by our Polish experience. Wedding all the achievements of the scientific-technical revolution to the socialist economy and intensifying the entire potential of socialism serve the interests of the vast majority of the people, but do not accord with the interests of certain groups which found life easier under the now obsolescent order, which, to put it mildly, gave them unwritten privileges.

I have studied the materials of the CPSU Central Committee January Plenum very closely. They are distinguished by an uncompromising approach and acute party-minded criticism of errors and their causes; there was absolutely accurate identification of all that had caused the stagnation phenomena. The way to effect the transformations and remove any barriers was clearly marked out. One firmly believes the projected goal of restructuring will be attained.

It is impossible not to go along with the analysis of the causes given by the CPSU Central Committee general secretary, when he talked about the stagnation phenomena and inertia in previous years. I believe that in Poland the germs of contradictions, which subsequently grew into conflict and caused a deep crisis, were not spotted in time and prevented, although the party masses had been making noises about this, distinct and loud on occasion. This cost my homeland and our party dear. It should be an important lesson.

The CPSU is at the head of the process of critical reappraisal, it is itself the initiator of the profound transformations, it is resolutely demanding openness in all areas of life, and is fighting dogmatism and conservatism and all manner of deviations from socialist ideals. This is testimony to the fact that the party is championing the Leninist view of reality.

The whole world is now closely following the historic process of plowing up the compacted soil of conservatism and inertia. Of course, past errors cannot obscure the achievements of socialism and its massive role in world social progress. Restructuring demands immense effort, broad cooperation among the fraternal parties, and activeness and innovation on the part of the masses.

The desire for transformation is also now more marked in other socialist countries too. I would call this the effect of the awakening of Marxist thought. The time has come to carefully analyze the rate of development in the most important spheres of life, including spiritual, cultural, and intellectual, and carry out a comparative assessment. Of course, there are specific differences of approach to the solution of these questions. However, the overall process of restructuring is common to us all.

It is also evident that if anyone tries to carry out restructuring using the old yardsticks, like using the old-fashioned abacus instead of a computer, he will essentially remain outside the revolutionary transformations. Marxism is not a set of abstract theories, but a method of investigating reality. One of its features is boldness. The new stage of the socialist revolution in the USSR -- and this definition fits the current process of fundamental and broad transformations -- will certainly have a positive impact on the development of other countries.

Another thing distinguishing the world socialist system from the capitalist system is that all the lessons are often common lessons for us and all accelerated movement forward is also a common asset.

Our concept of the harmoniously developed individual presupposes the education of a worthy person, one who is open and generous, one who has inner riches. The private ownership concept is succinctly expressed by the word "possess." That is, increasing one's personal wealth with a thought for the welfare of society. In our society a person has the right to acquire any goods, but with honestly earned money. It is very important for us to instill in him a clear awareness of how far to go so that he does not overstep the mark in providing for his own comfort.

The CPSU Central Committee January Plenum rightly reminded us that one reason for the voluntarist approach to the economy, again on the subject of pay, was the prejudice concerning the role of commodity-money relations and the effect of the law of value and the way it was often set up as something alien to socialism.

The new will not have an easy victory. The vanguard is so named because the rest follow it. [paragraph continues]

It must become a broader procession, an increasingly conscious march toward the attainment of lofty goals. The people are massively in favor of restructuring, the CPSU Central Committee general secretary said. He then pointed out there is a "substantial number of people who are slow to shrug off the burden of the past, who are biding their time, and even overtly slowing things down, attempting to prevent the broad development of the people's political, social, and labor activeness." It occurs to one how great is the role of the people's masse, the role of the working class, the intelligentsia, and people in the arts, science, and culture in overcoming this legacy which serves as an impediment and hindrance.

Such phenomena have been and are apparent here in Poland, although in a far worse form, particularly during the implementation of the process of socialist renewal, reforms, and development of democracy. It is a struggle. A real, uncompromising struggle. Conservatism is opposed to innovation and voluntarism is opposed to genuine democratization and people's self-management. In this situation a lag in the sphere of the development of Marxist theory, in the sphere of the social sciences makes itself felt in a negative way. Criticism and the confidence of the masses are two aspects of the same problem: the profound perception of the need for change.

It is more than apparent that all matters relating to accelerated development and progressive social transformations can only be implemented in conditions of peace. The militarists brandish their feeble argument about the military threat from the East. It has been said a thousand times that to carry out restructuring and reach a new level of social development, the Soviet Union and the entire socialist community need solid and everlasting world peace. The new Soviet proposals aimed at eliminating medium-range missiles in Europe are further convincing confirmation of this.

Mankind has probably reached a critical point in its development; it is at a turning point in history. The problems of world peace and the qualitatively new steps in science and technology and in the level of civilization as a whole -- all is interwoven, it all comes together in the one magnificent word "life." No one can afford to be indifferent toward the future of our life together on earth. Restructuring in the USSR and the fraternal socialist countries and the revolutionizing processes of accelerated creation for the happiness of us all -- this is the main argument for our sincerity and, at the same time, firm resolve in the struggle for a world without weapons, without bloodshed and conflicts. That is what it is, the banner of restructuring -- a constructive life for the creators today, tomorrow, and always.

KORNILOV QUESTIONS STATE OF UK UNDER THATCHER

LD271508 Moscow TASS in English 1451 GMT 24 Mar 87

["A Model To Emulate?" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow March 27 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Yuriy Kornilov writes:

A process of reorganisation and renovation is going on in the Soviet Union and the Soviet people consider it to be a major task of that process to give even more meaning to socialist democracy and to develop and translate into practice the fundamental principles of the socialist rule of the people to a fuller extent. A "recipe" for accomplishing that goal has all of a sudden come from -- London. British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, going for an official visit to Moscow, told the House of Commons that Britain will "have full confidence and trust in the Soviet Union if we feel she treats her people more similarily to the way we treat ours than is the case now." Regrettably, Mrs. Thatcher has not backed her words with facts. We will try to help her.

Socialism stamped out unemployment and not only proclaimed but guaranteed in practice the right to work for all the citizens of the socialist state. The Soviet people have every reason to view this as a major accomplishment of our revolution. The situation in Britain is different: In the seven years of the Conservatives' rule unemployment has more than trebled and 3.2 million people, or 11 per cent of the employable population, are out of jobs today. What would mean for the USSR an attempt to emulate Britain that Mrs. Thatcher urges? [sentence as received] A simple calculation shows that the Soviet Union would end up with an army of unemployed numbering almost 30 million (since the population of the Soviet Union is more than 280 million and that of Britain 57 million). What sort of model is this?

Furthermore, according to the British press, there are more than 100,000 homeless in Britain, whereas the number of people living in premises which are absolutely unsuitable for habitation is 1.2 million. What would Mrs. Thatcher's "recipe" mean for our country? Clearly, if the Soviet Government pursued a domestic policy similar to that of the "free" capitalist Britain, it would have at least 600,000 homeless. What sort of model is this?

Urging Moscow "to treat her people more similarly to the way we treat ours" and holding up London as a staunch champion of human rights and freedoms, Mrs. Thatcher never mentions such commonly known facts as the cancer of racism, eating deeper and deeper into Britain, the harsh persecution of "dissident" trade unionists and terror against participants in anti-war actions. Meanwhile, according to press reports, in the past few years more than 10,000 Britons have been arrested for participation in demonstrations of protest against the deployment of nuclear weapons on British soil.

Following the "British model," this country with a population of 280 million should imprison at least 50,000 anti-war campaigners. This is what Mrs. Thatcher is advocating, deliberately or inadvertantly, these "accomplishments" of British "democracy" we are being offered! [sentence as received]

No, Mrs Prime Minister, the Soviet people have no use for your advice and recipies. We in the USSR do not think that a model of respect for human rights is offered by realities in capitalist society, based on social inequality and injustice, racial and national oppression, the suppression of the civil rights of national and social minorities, discrimination against women and youth, propaganda of depravity and lack of moral values. Speaking about democracy and trust, we should say frankly that the Soviet people cannot trust those who shamelessly try to pass chalk for cheese. The Soviet public is seriously worried by the fact that the situation with human rights in Britain, far from improving, is giving more and more cause for alarm.

## IZVESTIYA BERATES UK STANCE ON WAR CRIMINALS

PM271654 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Mar 87 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by P. Shafeta, editor of the newspaper RADYANSKA VOLIN, under the rubric "No Statute of Limitations": "Wise Words, But..."]

[Text] A TASS correspondent has reported from London that the Conservative government and the British Foreign Office have refused to extradite to Soviet justice the Nazi war criminals Kirill Zvarich, Antanas Getsevichyus (also known as Geches), and others. The first was a member of a fascist punitive squad in Volyn during the war years, fled to Germany with the Hitlerites, and then turned up in Britain, where he passed himself off as the priest Stanislav Petrovskiy.

Working on documentary books about the crimes of the Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists, I recorded many testimonies from witnesses about this bandit's terrible atrocities. They also were spoken of at a rural assembly in the village of Tur in Volyn Oblast's Ratnovskiy Rayon in the spring of 1986. A total of 2,914 participants in that meeting signed a letter to British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, asking her to heed the voice of human conscience and the demands of international law and send the murderer back to where he left graves and ashes in his wake. A good deal of time has passed, but the inhabitants of the Volyn Polesye are still waiting for an answer to that letter, written in grief.

In Britain's newspaper THE TIMES on 26 May 1986, I saw a large, emotional photo of Mrs Thatcher, in which something has patently moved her. I learned from the text in the newspaper that the photo was taken during her visit to Israel, and that she was stunned by the sad Yad Vashem Memorial Museum, set up in memory of the Jews who, among many millions of peaceful people, were victims of fascism. "It is really terrible," the prime minister told the British newspaper correspondent. "Everyone should come and see it, so that they never forget. I am not quite sure that the new generation really knows what we were fighting against." In the visitors' book, THE TIMES reports, she wrote that "we must not allow the world to forget this."

Very correct, responsible words, and I would like to treat them with the respect they deserve. But their important meaning is devalued by the fact that war criminals found refuge in Britain, criminals who were personally involved in the 6 million deaths whose memory Mrs Thatcher honored with a wreath of yellow flowers, and many other deaths too. The report on her trip to Israel said that she was particularly strongly moved by a photo of a woman with a child, whom the Nazis are shooting. I remembered that in Volyn, near the village of Guta, people showed me the place where in the summer of 1942, Zvarich killed a child in the same way as in the photo in the museum. In the forest hamlet of Yarevishche, on 11 February 1944, he threw grenades and set fire to a house where a village wedding was in progress. Twenty-seven people died.

I wrote a letter to Mrs Thatcher saying that the just thoughts of a statesman are only worth something when they are backed up by just actions. Yet not only Kirill Zvarich and Getsevichyus are living in Britain after having committed such grave, unforgivable sins, many other criminals find shelter there from just retribution. As the English writer and humanist Henry Fielding said, he who has an impure conscience will not be able to conceal his guilt.

I waited 3 months for an answer to my letter, but it did not come. Now there is a report from London testifying to behavior on the part of the British authorities that is insulting to the memory of the victims of Nazism and illegal. Their reference to the statute of limitations and the supposedly later call for the extradition of war criminals has no foundation. As long ago as 1947 in his speech at a plenary meeting of the Second UN General Assembly Session, D.Z. Manuilskiy, then Ukrainian SSR people's commissar for foreign affairs, said that Nazi criminals are hiding in Britain in the guise of so-called displaced persons and that this is contrary to the UN Charter.

There is no statute of limitations for war criminals. People's desire for peace should be accompanied by the certainty that butchers will find no place anywhere in the world but in the dock.

## UN DELEGATION CONTINUES VISIT; TALKS WITH GORBACHEV

### Gorbachev-Thatcher 30 Mar Talks

LD301918 Moscow TASS in English 1859 GMT 30 Mar 87

[Text] Moscow March 30 TASS -- Mikhail Gorbachev met with British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher in the Kremlin on March 30.

They had a substantive and thorough discussion lasting several hours on major issues of the present time, including the decisive one, that of disarmament.

The conversation proceeded in a friendly way, although it was not without polemics which, however, was aimed at understanding each other better and seeing more clearly the positions and intentions and the political logic of each side.

The visit by the head of the British Government was important and necessary. Different as their positions and views were, the USSR and Great Britain remain partners in the search for the solution of the chief issue -- how to diminish the threat of war. This is the most important issue today.

The essence of the dialogue at that level is to look for ways for a better world.

Mikhail Gorbachev expressed strong disagreement with the view that security could be based on the position of strength. This was an old concept that had brought about many troubles in the post-war period.

The logic of Margaret Thatcher's reasoning made it clear that she stood for maintaining nuclear weapons and building up Britain's nuclear potential because she was convinced that the Soviet Union intended to impose communism around the world and that the threat of a Soviet attack on Western Europe remained.

Mikhail Gorbachev refuted with arguments this totally groundless opinion by relying on the philosophical concept of the contemporary world given at the 27th CPSU Congress, and pointed to the objective interrelationship between the goals of perfecting socialist society, reorganization and the peaceful foreign policy of the USSR.

A policy, especially in a situation of the imminent nuclear threat, should be based on realities, on co-existence between states with different social systems, on the right of free choice and independent development of each country. This is especially important for correct relations with the developing world.

The Soviet Union recognizes historical ties between states and regions in the present-day world -- be it West-East or North-South. It is necessary to make all these relations wholesome. Let us think about that -- how to ensure a balance of security, a balance of political and economic interests.

It is very important, Gorbachev said, that a major and at times acute discussion was held on problems in relations between states with different systems since herein is the starting point of misreading the Soviet Union's intentions and actions.

Having different views on the origination of regional conflicts, the interlocutors agreed that they should be settled by political means.

Margaret Thatcher kept forth at length on the positive aspects of Western democracy, British democracy in particular. But she heard strong arguments in debates on these issues. It is important, however, that frank exchanges of views took place on that subject, too. A dispute on any questions, if it is serious and not speculative, also is useful: It prevents thoughts from standing still and highlights what has seemed clear even without discussion.

The sides concentrated on ways of curbing the arms race. We are not going to make war on the U.S., or on Britain, or on anyone else, Mikhail Gorbachev said. This explains our initiatives and concrete steps. But we do not see any adequate response to them. We have been seeing for two years the same picture: As soon as there is a glimmer of hope for a positive solution, Washington, London, Paris and Bonn immediately bend their efforts to find pretexts to hold back the process because of the Soviet Union's "superiority."

And now we are seeing attempts to block the INF talks. Detaching the INF problem from the package, we hoped for British and French support. But where is it, that support?

The Soviet Union has done a good deal to give an impetus to the arms reduction talks. She has agreed not to count the British and French nuclear potentials, although they keep growing and being upgraded. But all this is quickly "forgotten" and more concessions are expected from the Soviet Union.

Mikhail Gorbachev strongly disagreed with the view that the elimination of nuclear weapons in Europe would leave the Soviet Union with an overwhelming superiority in conventional weapons and create a political threat to Western Europe. He reiterated the Soviet Union's readiness to enter most deep-going and comprehensive talks on reductions in the conventional armaments and armed forces of both military alliances.

Mikhail Gorbachev noted that the Soviet proposals took into consideration the concerns of Western Europe and Britain, including those related to conventional and chemical weapons. It is no chance. We want to dispel Western mistrust. It is not bluff. It is our course of principle, which we formulated in long and deep deliberations and approved at the highest forum of the country.

We stand for a search for ways to a world with less weaponry. Trust cannot arise from nothing. What we need is talks, guests, not expectations. Let us go to Stockholm-2 and discuss conventional weapons there, exploring every aspect and leaving nothing aside.

Mikhail Gorbachev thoroughly briefed Margaret Thatcher on how the Reykjavik talks had really proceeded and how a unique chance had been missed to take a historic step by initiating real nuclear disarmament.

In this context the sides attached serious importance to the preservation of the ABM Treaty. Mikhail Gorbachev reaffirmed that the relationship between cuts in strategic offensive weapons and the non-placement of weapons in outer space was strategic linkage. We will never untie that package. We have a study of ways to depreciate SDI without spending mad funds that America will need to develop it. But who needs it except those who would like to earn nine-digit profits from it? He asked his visitor to think if it was admissible that all, primarily Europe, should become hostages to SDI-oriented war business.

Asked by Margaret Thatcher, Mikhail Gorbachev described in detail the nature, character and progress of reorganization in the Soviet Union, the problems that had to be tackled, difficulties and prospects offered to Soviet society by reorganization. We are overcoming a paradox in our development, with perhaps the best educated society in the world having long been unable properly to use its immense intellectual potential. We will do so through democracy, through the development of the entire potential of the socialist system.

Margaret Thatcher displayed much interest in what was taking place in the USSR and expressed the hope that these processes would be a success. She gave assurances that the West in general and she in particular had an interest in the ongoing processes in the Soviet Union bearing fruit.

As for humanitarian issues, Mikhail Gorbachev said, there is much in them which is speculative, pointed and intended to misrepresent the Soviet Union.

We should look for solutions to all problems and take steps towards each other while remaining different. It is not a shortcoming but advantage. We are ready to act in politics with a broad approach, aware of inter-dependencies not only within the European framework but on a world scale. And let Western Europe rid itself early of fears of the Soviet Union. She should make a greater contribution to world politics, to the international process. She has every opportunity to do so.

But we still have the impression that Britain and her prime minister are not playing the role which they could play today, at this critical point, when the most important and urgent task is to take first steps towards reducing nuclear weapons.

Mikhail Gorbachev and Margaret Thatcher noted that as a result of extensive exchanges of views they had mutual understanding and close positions on the elimination of medium-range missiles in Europe and that they were ready to bring talks on the elimination of chemical weapons to their conclusion and advocated the settlement of all the problems related to the need to reduce conventional armaments and armed forces in Europe.

The conversation was broad, frank and constructive and featured a search for solutions in favour of a safer world and approaches to cooperation.

The sides expressed their desire to broaden and deepen political dialogue and to develop closer relations between the two countries.

They noted the need for the further advancement of the Helsinki process to build a "common European home" with all its aspects, including economic, scientific, cultural and humanitarian ones, among them, the reunification of families and foreign travel. All this will help forge trust and contribute to better international relations as a whole.

We stand for cooperation with Britain, Mikhail Gorbachev said, for it becoming broader, deeper and friendlier, and for trust between us growing stronger. He expressed the hope that this was precisely what would happen. It would benefit Britain, the Soviet Union, Europe and the world as a whole.

'Friendly' Talks; 'Controversy'

LD301914 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 30 Mar 87

[Text] We have just received the following report:

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev held a meeting in the Kremlin today with British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher. For several hours the conversation ranged widely and in depth over major issues of the present time, including the decisive one of disarmament. The conversation was conducted in a friendly tone, though not without controversy which also, however, served the purpose of better understanding one another and more clearly grasping each other's positions and intentions and political logic.

The British head of government's visit was important and necessary, for however their positions and views might differ, the USSR and Britain remain partners in seeking a resolution of the chief issue -- that of how to reduce the danger of war. That is now the chief thing of all.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev voiced resolute disagreement with the view that security can be built on a policy founded on strength. That is an old concept which has already brought many misfortunes in the postwar period. We are for cooperation with Britain, said Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, for it becoming broader and deeper and friendly in nature, so that there might be a growth in trust between us. He voiced the hope that this will ultimately be so.

Talks Assessed; Howe-Shevardnadze

LD301137 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1016 GMT 30 Mar 87

[By Chris Moncrieff, PA chief political correspondent in Moscow]

[Text] The first round of crucial talks between Mrs Thatcher and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev in the Kremlin today ran well over the scheduled two hours. The talks were due to finish at 10 am BST but, as reporters gathered for a press briefing, there was no sign of the two leaders emerging. Only interpreters and note-takers were present for the first session of the discussions, which are expected to have a critical influence in the East-West disarmament negotiations.

Meanwhile, Foreign Secretary Sir Geoffrey Howe had separate talks with his Soviet counterpart Mr Eduard Shevardnadze. Those covered bilateral relationships between Britain and the USSR and broadened out into wider international affairs. These talks were said to have taken place "in a very good atmosphere".

Later today the two foreign ministers will join Mrs Thatcher and Mr Gorbachev for the final round of the talks.

The two leaders, sitting in the splendour of the Kremlin's green-pillared Catherine Hall, were together alone -- apart from interpreters and note-takers -- for nearly four hours. And although the diplomatic term "forthright" normally implies animosity, British Government sources insisted there had been no hostility between them.

The talks resume later this afternoon. But before the first phase broke up, Mr Gorbachev probably summed up their mood when he said jokingly: "I would love to go on until 6 pm but cannot keep you any longer from your lunch."

When a smiling Mrs Thatcher, shielded from the icy winds by a black-fur lined hat and black coat, emerged from the Kremlin she was asked why the talks had gone on so long. She replied: "They were too interesting to break off. We are going back to resume what has been a very frank, wide-ranging discussion over world affairs and different political systems. We talked extensively about arms control."

Asked if they had got down to the "nitty gritty," she replied" "Yes, we did."

There is no doubt that, even though the two leaders did not duck discussing particularly sensitive issues, the first phase of the talks was successful from Mrs Thatcher's point of view. Both made the point at the beginning that, while they may not like each other's political systems, they must recognise that they have to live side by side in the world and gain a deep understanding of each other's philosophies.

While Mrs Thatcher protests about human rights in the Soviet Union, the Russians believe the minority population in Northern Ireland is being persecuted by the British Government. This was the very point raised by Mr Gorbachev when the subject of human rights was discussed. But British sources said Mrs Thatcher "explained" the British position to the Soviet leader:

However, there was no reference this morning to the imprisonment of peace protesters in Britain -- an allegation that the Soviet press has been directing at Mrs Thatcher almost daily in the run-up to her arrival in Moscow on Saturday.

Britain's nuclear weapons, and the proposed Trident system, were also raised during discussion on arms control. The Kremlin has said that Britain must "surrender" its nuclear weapons if the disarmament talks in Geneva prove successful. But Mrs Thatcher has said in the past -- and made it clear again today -- that this could not be an issue.

British Government sources characterised this morning's discussions as "vigorous, lively and animated, even forthright but never hostile". And Mrs Thatcher herself said she found the talks "fascinating". The British spokesman said: "They are exploring each other's minds and trying to get a better understanding of each other."

The prime minister did not discuss with Mr Gorbachev in any detail individual human rights cases in the Soviet Union.

However, Sir Geoffrey Howe, the foreign secretary, in his separate talks this morning with his Soviet counterpart Mr Eduard Shevardnadze, did discuss some individual cases.

This afternoon the two foreign ministers were joining the two leaders in talks. They were scheduled to finish at 2:30 PM British time, but it seemed certain they would over-run a second time.

## Shevardnadze-Howe Talks 'Frank'

LD301052 Moscow TASS in English 1041 GMT 30 Mar 87

[Text] Moscow March 30 TASS -- Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU), minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, has had a conversation with Geoffrey Howe, British secretary of state for foreign and Commonwealth affairs, within the framework of Soviet-British talks being held in Moscow between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher of Britain.

During the conversation, there was a frank and businesslike exchange of views on topical international problems and on matters of bilateral Soviet-British relations.

## Foreign Ministers Sign Protocol

LD310916 Moscow TASS in English 0905 GMT 31 Mar 87

[Text] Moscow March 31 TASS -- Four Soviet-British documents were signed in the Kremlin today in the presence of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Nikolay Ryzhkov, a member of the CPSU Central Committee's Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher of Britain.

The documents included an agreement between the governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on cooperation in studying and using outer space for peaceful purposes, an intergovernmental agreement to improve direct communications between the Kremlin and the British prime minister's residence in London, a memorandum of understanding between the two governments on new areas of cooperation in the fields of information, culture and education, and an agreement on the mutual granting of land plots for building new embassy compounds in Moscow and London.

The documents were signed by Eduard Shevardnadze, a member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and foreign minister of the USSR, and Geoffrey Howe, secretary of state for foreign and Commonwealth affairs of Britain.

## Thatcher Sees Sakharov, Ryzhkov

LD311134 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1042 GMT 31 Mar 87

[Text] Mrs Thatcher today met the prominent Soviet dissident Andrey Sakharov in a show of support for human rights activists in the USSR. The meeting, over lunch, took place at the British Embassy in Moscow on the fourth day of her historic visit to the Soviet Union. The prime minister swept up the embassy drive in a gleaming black Zil limousine shortly after Mr Sakharov, the 1975 Nobel Peace Prize laureate, arrived in an embassy car with his wife and fellow dissident Yelena Bonner.

Mr Sakharov, whose internal exile of almost seven years was lifted by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev in December, said his mood was "good" but that he would not make any further statements to reporters until the lunch was over. The meeting indicated continued British concern with the treatment of Soviet dissidents, a point frequently raised by Mrs Thatcher in speeches at home. Embassy officials said Mrs Thatcher would play host to the Sakharovs at a small lunch in the embassy dining room before resuming her meetings with Soviet officials in the afternoon.

Earlier, Mrs Thatcher met Soviet Premier Nikolay Ryzhkov and told reporters afterwards that her lengthy talks yesterday with Mr Gorbachev had been "very good". "We set a target for increased trade and I hope it will lead to increased friendship and increased understanding," she said. Soviet officials described the discussions as "businesslike" while British sources said they were "frank and vigorous but never hostile." They said the talks "had achieved a deep understanding of each other's points of view".

The two leaders are still said to be good friends despite failing to agree on the key issues of human rights and arms control. Mrs Thatcher told the Soviet leader in a Kremlin speech last night that the West would have more confidence and trust in him if he fully met his human rights commitments and if he withdrew Soviet troops from Afghanistan.

Mr Gorbachev in his banquet speech, spoke of the "evil inherent in the nuclear deterrent ideology and policy," and called for Britain to join in a nuclear test ban.

## Thatcher Meets Peace Committee

PM301905 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Mar 87 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "The Public's Stance"]

[Text] A delegation of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace visited Prime Minister M. Thatcher at the British Embassy in Moscow on 30 March.

On behalf of the Soviet public, the delegation welcomed the arrival of the British prime minister and expressed the hope that it would promote the development of normal mutual relations between the two countries and the improvement of the situation in the world. At the same time, the delegation expressed total disagreement with the British prime minister's assertions that nuclear weapons are not an evil but a "boon" for mankind and in this regard voiced concern at the course of the British Government, which runs counter to the prospect which has opened up before the whole world for a radical reduction and total elimination of nuclear weapons in Europe and throughout the planet. Understanding the motives of the Soviet Government which, for the purpose of the speediest start to nuclear disarmament, has agreed for the time being not to take account of the British nuclear potential, the Soviet public, for its part, cannot shut its eyes to the existence of British nuclear forces and its plans to increase them, nor to the support for the U.S. "Star Wars" plans. London's official stance on the issue of the total elimination of Soviet and American medium-range missiles in Europe remains contradictory.

The prime minister's attention was also drawn to the scarcity of truthful information in Great Britain about the life of the Soviet people. It is intolerable that millions of British people should derive their information about our country from nonobjective sources.

Trust between the two countries, the representatives of the Soviet peace movement stressed, cannot be built upon a position of strength or of that notorious "toughness," nor upon "demands" that the assence of our socialist system be changed; it must be created by specific acts of goodwill. In this respect the wish was expressed that M. Thatcher would use her stay in the Soviet Union to obtain truthful information about the important processes which are taking place in the domestic and foreign policy of the USSR.

## UK Coverage of Visit Noted

PM310947 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 31 Mar 87 p 3

[Own correspondent Yu. Sagaydak Dispatch: "Honest Britain's Hopes"]

[Excerpts] London -- Britain's conservative press, which conducted a systematic anti-Soviet campaign on the eve of Prime Minister M. Thatcher's visit to the USSR, is in a state of shock. On Saturday, the day the British leader arrived on Soviet soil, the flagship of the bourgeois mass media -- THE DAILY TELEGRAPH -- published the results of a public opinion poll conducted by the Gallup Institute. Some 56 percent of those polled declared that the Soviet leadership headed by M.S. Gorbachev is "doing everything possible to reach an arms control agreement," whereas only 12 percent of Britons came out in support of President's policy in the nuclear weapons sphere. Another result which speaks for itself: According to the same poll, 57 percent of the British believe that "the Russians would like to maintain friendly relations with the West." [paragraph continues]

This means the anti-Soviet campaign did not work, Fleet Street was firing blanks from its big propaganda guns, and the truth about the Soviet Union is penetrating the British Isles despite the efforts of the "free and democratic" press...

The visit by British Prime Minister M. Thatcher is the center of attention in the country's mass media. Features in television news programs and extensive press commentaries are being devoted to it. It is gratifying that the voices of those political commentators who raise serious questions of Soviet-British relations and try to find the answer to the question of how we should build them in the future, how to achieve greater trust and mutual understanding, and how to rid Europe of nuclear weapons are being heard increasingly loudly.

"Mrs. Thatcher is really not in Moscow to discuss questions of an improvement in the human rights situation in the USSR... Her primary task is to reach agreement with the Soviet leadership on how to end the nuclear threat in the world," THE INDEPENDENT editorializes. [passage omitted]

Well, Soviet people also advocate progress in negotiations, ridding Europe of nuclear weapons, and arranging a constructive and frank dialogue. The way to the revival of European detente and to mutual understanding is open! It is only up to the British leadership: Either take advantage of the present opportunities or continue the policy of confrontation with the Soviet Union -- an unpopular policy with the British.

## BRIEFS

SHIPPING COMMISSION WITH UK -- Moscow March 27 TASS -- Soviet-British cooperation in Shipping was discussed at the 17th session of the bilateral commission, closed here today. The sides exchanged information on the present state of sea carriage between ports in the USSR and Great Britain and views on prospects for its development. The sides positively assessed the activity of the joint regular freight line organized by the Baltic and Latvian shipping lines from the Soviet side and the United Baltic Corporation from the British side. [Excerpt] [Moscow TASS in English 1655 GMT 27 Mar 87 LD]

FINNISH MEDIA COOPERATION -- A working protocol on cooperation between the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting and the Finnish Television company Yleisradio for the year 1987 was signed in Moscow today. It provides for the further development of exchanges of television and radio materials on the life of peoples of the USSR and Finland, and the rendering of mutual assistance to television journalists and camera groups in preparing programs on major events in the two countries. Much space is taken up by materials devoted to the 70th Great October Socialist Revolution anniversary and the 70th anniversary of the proclamation of Finland's independence. The document was signed by Comrade Aksenov, chairman of USSR Gostelradio; and Kiuru [as heard], general director of Yleisradio. [Text] [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 24 Mar 87 LD]

KING HUSAYN, PARLIAMENTARIANS MEET DELEGATION

PM301331 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Mar 87 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading "Interparliamentary Ties"]

[Text] Amman, 26 Mar -- King Husayn of Jordan has received a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by V.P. Orlov, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. The delegation also includes USSR Supreme Soviet Deputies G.I. Yeremey, S.A. Losev, and A. Sharipov.

During the friendly conversation King Husayn gave a high appraisal of the Soviet Union's policy aimed at achieving a just and comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict and restoring the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine. The head of the Jordanian state expressed his gratitude to the Soviet leadership for its efforts aimed at defending the Arabs' just struggle for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the occupied Arab territories and the establishment of lasting peace in the Near East. The Soviet Union's consistent, persistent struggle for peace and security throughout the world and for mankind's deliverance from the threat of nuclear catastrophe, which is in the highest interests of present and future generations, was noted with satisfaction. The Soviet Union's peace-loving foreign policy course has the full support of Jordan and all peace-loving peoples. The visit by the Soviet parliamentary delegation will undoubtedly give new impetus to the development of relations between our two countries, King Husayn stressed in conclusion.

The Soviet parliamentary delegation had a meeting with A.K. al-Louzi, president of the Jordanian Senate; I. Hijazi, first deputy chairman of the House of Representatives; R. al-Bataynah, chairman of the House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Commission; senators and representatives from the Jordanian National Assembly; and T. al-Masri, Jordanian foreign minister.

A.K. al-Louzi, I. Hijazi, R. al-Bataynah, and other members of the Jordanian parliament spoke with anger and pain about the trampling of human rights in the Arab territories seized by Israel. Tel Aviv continues to create paramilitary Israeli settlements on the West Bank of the River Jordan and in the Gaza Strip, continues to confiscate age-old Arab lands, and resorts to the brutal repression and torture of students and all Arabs who speak in favor of fulfilling the Palestinians' inalienable right to self-determination and the creation of their own independent Palestinian state. Israel is attempting to perpetuate its occupation of the Arab territories. It was particularly noted that the Israeli aggressors rely on the United States for assistance and suppport in implementing their annexationist plans. The Jordanian side reaffirmed that Jorden actively supports the idea of convening an international conference on the Near East and considers the speediest convening of such a conference to be the surest way to a settlement of the Near East crisis.

V.P. Orlov invited a Jordanian parliamentary delegation to pay the Soviet Union an official visit. The invitation was gratefully accepted.

TALYZIN STOPS OVER IN ADEN, MEETS PDRY PREMIER

LD291109 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 29 Mar 87

[Text] The Soviet party and state delegation led by Comrade Talyzin, which is staying in Aden, has met with Democratic Yemen Prime Minister Nu'man. During the conversation questions of the further development of USSR-South Yemen relations, other questions of mutual interest were discussed. Today the Soviet delegation left by air for Maputo.

## CPSU DELEGATION ATTENDS MEXICAN PARTY CONGRESS

LD271006 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1042 GMT 26 Mar 87

[Excerpts] Mexico City, 26 Mar (TASS) -- "The Third Congress of the United Socialist Party of Mexico (USPM) has opened here." [passage omitted]

"Taking part in the work of the forum are nearly 500 delegates representing the USPM in various states of the country, as well as delegations from the socialist and communist parties, and national liberation movements from 35 countries. The CPSU delegation is headed by I.T. Frolov, member of the CPSU Central Commttee and chief editor of KOMMUNIST. [Passage omitted]

### Central Committee Greetings

PM261819 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Mar 87 First Edition p 1

[Message from the CPSU Central Committee to the Third United Socialist Party of Mexico Congress]

[Text] To the Third United Socialist Party of Mexico Congress.

Dear Comrades!

The CPSU Central Committee warmly greets the delegates to the Third United Socialist Party of Mexico [PSUM] Congress.

The ideals of independence and freedom and the principles of all peoples' sovereign right to themselves determine their destiny and the path of their development, and also the principle of noninterference in the internal affairs of other countries, are dear to the Soviet and Mexican people. Soviet Communists are in solidarity with the struggle of progressive, democratic forces in Mexico against imperialism's aggressive policy in Central America and throughout the Latin American region. An important role is played in this struggle by the PSUM, which defends the vital interests of the Mexican working people.

To fully protect people's national independence against hegemonist encroachment, realize the aims of the worker and liberation movement, and ensure the establishment of a just world economic order -- all of this is possible only in a world free of the threat of thermonuclear catastrophe. Growing awareness of the need for energetic action to save world civilization is evidenced by the broad international support for the program to eliminate nuclear and other types of mass destruction weapons by the end of the century. The USSR highly values Mexico's stand in this issue and its fruitful participation in the activity of the "Delhi Six," which makes a large contribution to the cause of nuclear disarmament.

The CPSU's principled choice in favor of a nuclear-free world and stronger cooperation and mutual trust between states with different social systems is inseparable from the revolutionary restructuring process taking place in our country. Communists and all the working people of the Soviet Union are now working at a furious pace to resolve the task set by the 27th congress -- to speed up the socioeconomic development of Soviet society, increase and intensify democracy in our society, and raise socialism to a qualitatively new level. This process was given new, decisive impetus at the CPSU Central Committee January Plenum.

Although they operate under different conditions, the CPSU and the PSUM are part of a common struggle against imperialism and reaction, for mankind's survival, and for the working people's freedom and happiness.

May friendly ties and cooperation develop between the CPSU and the PSUM!

Long live Soviet-Mexican friendship!

The CPSU Central Committee.

KGB'S CHEBRIKOV CONTINUES VISIT TO CUBA

LD302151 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 30 Mar 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The official friendly visit to Cuba by Comrade Chebrikov continues. On 29 march he toured old Havana, which UNESCO has named part of the cultural heritage of mankind, and he visited museums in the Cuban capital. Today Fidel Castro and Viktor Mikhaylovich Chebrikov visited the biotechnology and genetic engineering institute, and also visited a major stockbreeding farm in Havana province, (?Los Naranjos).

Castro-Chebrikov Meeting

PM301345 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Mar First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Visit to Cuba"]

[Text] Havana, 29 Mar -- V.M. Chebrikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman the USSR Committee for State Security, who is on an official friendly visit here, has met with Fidel Castro, first secretary of the Communist Party of Cuba [PCC] Central Committee and president of the Councils of State and of Ministers. Taking part in talks were Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, member of the PCC Central Committee Politburo and vice president of the Councils of State and of Ministers; Jose Ramon Machado Ventura, member of the PCC Central Committee Politburo and Secretariat; Jorge Risquet, member of the PCC Central Committee Politburo and Secretariat; and Division General Jose Abrahantes, member of the PCC Central Committee and minister of the interior.

V.M. Chebrikov conveyed cordial greetings and best wishes to Fidel Castro and the entire Cuban leadership from M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and other Soviet leaders. In turn, Fidel Castro expressed sincere appreciation for the attention and warm words. He asked that fraternal greetings be conveyed to M.S. Gorbachev, the CPSU Central Committee, the Soviet Government, and the entire Soviet people.

Fidel Castro spoke about the work which is under way in Cuba to implement the decisions of the Third PCC Congress aimed at improving socialist production and social relations and introducing effective forms and methods of accelerating socialist building. On behalf of the Soviet leadership V.M. Chebrikov wished the Communists and all socialist Cuba's working people the successful implementation of their plans.

V.M. Chebrikov reported on the first results of the implementation in the USSR of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and about the progress of the process of restructuring and renewal in various spheres of Soviet society's life. The special importance for the work of Communists and the entire Soviet people of the the CPSU Central Committee January (1987) Plenum, which defined restructuring and cadre policy tasks at the present stage of socialist building with a view to fully revealing the inexhaustible potential of socialism, was emphasized. Fidel Castro spoke highly of the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee January Plenum and wished Soviet Communists and all the Soviet working people success in the swift implementation of those decisions.

A.S. Kapto, Soviet ambassador to the Republic of Cuba, was present at the meeting.

On the same day V.M. Chebrikov laid a wreath at the monument to Jose Marti, the Cuban people's national hero.

MOSCOW CARRIES STATEMENT FROM CHILEAN COMMUNISTS

PY312130 Moscow in Spanish to Chile 2100 GMT 25 Mar 87

[Text] The top leaders of the PCCh [Communist Party of Chile] have expressed support for socialist leader Clodomiro Almeyda. Rodrigo Rojas, member of the PCCh directorate, now reads this statement:

[Begin Rojas recording] We applaud the patriotic decision by Socialist Party Secretary Comrade Clodomiro Almeyda to return to Chile and to exercise his right to live in the country. The dictatorship has denied him this right, as it has thousands of other Chileans, since Almeyda was expelled from the country in 1975. The Chilean communists send our fraternal embrace to our dear Comrade Clodomiro Almeyda, and we demand respect for his right to live in our country, for his freedom, and for his personal security.

We call on all the democratic governments, parties, organization, and personalities of the world to demand from the Pinochet dictatorship immediate release, respect, and security for the former vice president of the republic, Comrade Clodomiro Almeyda, and an end to the exile of all Chileans, including Luis Corvalan, (Nieta Campusan), Manuel Cantero, (Campo Facio), Jorge Insunza, Gladys Marin, Orlando Millas, Jorge Montes, Mario Navarro, Rodrigo Rojas, (Peyton) and Americo Perdiz. [end recording]

## PRAVDA DETAILS EXPERIMENTAL ELECTION RULES

PM301207 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Mar 87 First Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Elections in Multiseat Districts"]

[Text] In accordance with the resolutions adopted by union republic Supreme Soviet Presidiums, elections to rayon, city (under rayon jurisdiction), settlement, and rural soviets will be held on the basis of multiseat [mnogomandatnyy] electoral okrugs in one rayon in union republics without oblast divisions, autonomous republics, krays, and oblasts as an experiment in the upcoming local soviet elections.

Multiseat electoral okrugs are to be formed by the relevant ispolkoms by merging existing electoral okrugs. They can cover individual population centers, microrayons, quarters, streets, and other component parts of population centers. The number of deputies elected in each multiseat okrug will be established on the basis of the size of the given okrug's population in relation to the total number of deputies to be elected to the soviet.

The number of candidate deputies nominated in multiseat electoral okrugs should, as a rule, exceed the number of seats in the electoral okrug.

An okrug election conference will be held when various organs of public organizations, labor collectives, general meetings, meetings of citizens at their places of residence, and meetings of servicemen in their military units nominate candidate deputies for multiseat electoral okrugs. The okrug election conference shall discuss the candidates nominated in the okrug, decide on whether to support them or, if necessary, by agreement with the organizations nominating the candidate deputies, make changes to the list of nominated candidates in the okrug, and then approve the list and present it to the okrug electoral commission for the registration of the candidate deputies. If all candidate deputies in the electoral okrug are nominated by one organ of a public organization, labor collective, general meeting, meeting of citizens at their place of residence, or meeting of servicemen at their military unit, an okrug election conference shall not be held.

Registration of candidate deputies shall be carried out by the relevant okrug electoral commission. It shall compile a single protocol indicating all the candidate deputies registered for the multiseat electoral okrug in alphabetical order. The okrug electoral commission is to decide on approving the text of the voting slip. The list of candidate deputies registered for each electoral okrug is to be published in the established order.

Voting shall take place for all candidate deputies registered and included on the voting slip. When completing the voting slip voters shall strike out the names of those candidates for whom they do not wish to vote and leave the other names untouched. Voting slips not completed in this way shall be deemed null and void.

Candidate deputies who poll more than half of the votes of okrug voters registered on the electoral roll shall be deemed elected to represent the multiseat electoral okrug. If as a result of the voting the number of elected deputies is greater than the number of seats in the electoral okrug, the deputies who polled the fewest votes shall be deemed elected as reserve deputies to the corresponding soviet. Reserve deputies shall be given a certificate of election.

If an equal number of votes is cast, making it impossible to determine the elected deputies, the relevant rayon, city, settlement, or rural electoral commission shall instruct the okrug electoral commission to hold a repeat election for the given candidate deputies within 2 weeks.

If a deputy leaves the soviet his seat shall pass to the reserve deputy who polled the most votes among the other reserve deputies in the okrug. This reserve deputy's powers as a soviet deputy shall be recognized by the soviet in question upon representation from the soviet's credentials commission. Reserve deputies shall participate in the work of soviets and their organs with the right to a consultative vote and shall enjoy deputies' right of immunity and guarantees of the protection of the labor rights laid down by the law for soviet deputies.

These regulations are being introduced as experimental norms and shall operate during the period in office of the next convocation of local soviets.

## VOLUME OF ANTHOLOGY OF CPSU DOCUMENTS PUBLISHED

PM241645 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Mar 87 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Anthology of CPSU Documents"]

[Text] Volume 13 of the ninth enlarged and amended edition of the anthology "The CPSU in Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses, Conferences, and Central Committee Plenums" [KPSS v rezolyutsiyakh i resheniyakh syezdov, konferentsiy i Plenumov Tsk"] has been published. The book contains the most important party documents for the period from February 1976 through October 1980.

The volume opens with materials from the 25th CPSU Congress, which summarized the results of the 9th 5-Year Plan and approved the Basic Guidelines for the development of the USSR national economy for 1976-1980. The documents show the party's organizational, political, and ideological activity aimed at increasing production efficiency, accelerating scientific and technical progress, and improving economic management.

The materials provide extensive coverage of the foreign policy course of the CPSU and the Soviet state aimed at consolidating the positions of real socialism and preserving world peace and describe the Communist Party's struggle for the relaxation of international tension and the strengthening of the peoples' security and against the threat of nuclear war.

The volume has been prepared for publication by the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxims-Leninism and the CPSU Central Committee General Section and is published by the Political Literature Publishing House.

## FURTHER REPORTS ON MARCH JOURNALISTS' CONGRESS

### PRAVDA Cites Final Day

PM301601 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Mar 87 Second Edition pp 1, 3

[TASS report: "To Justify the Party's Trust"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] To make a fitting contribution to acceleration, B.Sh. Keremi, chairman of the Turkmen Journalists Union Board, said, we must restructure ourselves swiftly. [paragraph continues]

The speaker made suggestions regarding the cadre restructuring of newspapers published in national languages, and expressed his opinion on several practical issues concerning mutual relations between local newspapers and TASS.

In the closing speech, V.G. Afanasyev, chairman of the USSR Journalists Union Board, noted that the congress was held actively and in a critically constructive spirit, and that many interesting suggestions were made. Delegates focused their main attention in speeches on the restructuring of journalists' work and the enhancement of its efficiency. It is necessary to improve the content of our work, seek new forms, and do everything to ensure that we journalists give active help to the party and the people in the cause of restructuring, the cause of acceleration.

A congress resolution was adopted.

The congress adopted a new edition of the USSR Journalists Union Statute.

The USSR Journalists Union Board and Central Auditing Commission were elected.

Taking part in the work of the concluding session of the Sixth USSR Journalists Union Congress were Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and senior officials from the CPSU Central Committee. [passage omitted]

## LE MONDE on Congress 'Clashes'

PM271124 Paris LE MONDE in French 18 Mar 87 p 3

[Dominque Dhombres dispatch: "Lively Debates But Expected Reelection of Mr Afanasyev"]

[Text] Moscow -- The Sixth Soviet Journalists' Congress which was held in Moscow from Saturday 14 to Monday 16 March, gave rise to lively clashes between conservatives and advocates of change. On Monday, Viktor Afanasyev, chief editor of PRAVDA, was reelected chairman of the Journalists' Union, an institution which has 85,000 members. the previous congress was held in 1982.

CPSU General Secretary Gorbachev did not attend the congress, leaving it up to Mr Ligachev (number two and chief of ideology) to set the tone. In Mr Ligachev's view, journalists must make a contribution to change by their criticisms, and not hesitate to personally criticize incompetent or corrupt cadres. Mr Ligachev thinks this method will bring out the socialist system's advantages.

Why Jam Foreign Radios? [subhead]

Mr Afanasyev is situated between the most conservative journalists, who want to fully maintain "officialese" and the "new journalists" with a more modern and at times very aggressive style. His election gave rise to a veritable "happening." The 760 congress delegates were to elect a collective leadership of around 200 people. An IZVESTIYA journalist asked for the vote to be conducted by secret ballot. This is normal practice for a congress of this type but no written list of candidates had been prepared....

This document therefore had to be hurriedly drawn up; after a break in the session, the congress delegates had the right to delete names and add others. It would obviously be interesting to know how many votes Mr Afanasyev obtained, but this is not yet known. The collective leadership elected in this way then appointed its chairman and a board. This election probably took place by a show of hands.

One of the liveliest clashes of the 3-day congress was between two stars of the written press: Yuriy Zhukov (PRAVDA) referred to 1946, stating that journalists worked better in those days; Aleksandr Bovin (IZVESTIYA) gave a sharp reply to this praise of the good old Stalinist days, which may have been ironic, by calling for a more independent spirit among Soviet journalists. Mr. Bovin also condemned the jamming of foreign radio stations and strongly criticized -- unusually in this kind of forum -- two institutions suspected of sabotaging the so-called "openness" policy: the Defense Ministry and the Foreign Ministry.

The IZVESTIYA commentator, who at one time had the job of writing Mr Brezhnev's speeches, also explained with bitterness that it was impossible for a Soviet journalist to write a critical article after a visit to one of the Warsaw pact states. The puzzling thing is that Mr Zhukov, who was playing the role of resident Stalinist, said he "fully agreed" with Mr Bovin who gave the impression of being a "liberal."

Material considerations were not absent from the minds of the congress delegates. Several called for wage increases and an improvement in working conditions. The essential thing was a far-reaching debate between those who want to speed up change in Soviet society and those who fear that things may get out of control.

According to the official report, the congress "called on all workers in the Soviet press to provide an accurate, colorful, and lively account of the current restructuring process in the country and of the policy of openness, democratization, and speeding up economic and social development."

Dogmas were reaffirmed in a timely fashion. Journalists must "defend the communist way of thinking in a combative and energetic way, criticize all aspects of bourgeois ideology, and refute lies about the socialist way of life and the Soviet Union's foreign policy," according to the resolution adopted at the end of the congress.

## PRAVDA Covers Debates

PM301249 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Mar 87 Second Edition pp 1, 2, 3

[TASS report: "On the Pulse of Restructuring. Sixth USSR Journalists Union Congress"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] The press must restructure and reorganize itself at a fast pace, V.V. Chikin, chief editor of the newspaper SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, emphasized on opening the debate. This is far from always the case. Numerous and diverse labels and many hackneyed usages have appeared, there is a danger of phrasemongering. Restructuring must move in the direction of the objectivization of life. What is needed is not a criminal but a social investigation of misdemeanors and problems, of events and personalities.

The task of newspapers is to become the collective organizers of restructuring and to focus attention on genuine democratization and the creation of a climate of socialist morality. The Great October's 70th anniversary, for which we are preparing, offers an excellent opportunity to demonstrate socialism, its living soul, and its genuine creators. This must be done honestly, in a talented fashion, with enormous respect for Soviet man.

P.V. Novikov, chairman of the Donetsk Oblast Journalists Organization Board, spoke of the need to enhance the prestige of journalists and the efficacy of their statements. Of course, our criticism must be 100 percent truthful, andnot even a fraction less, the speaker declared. There must also be 100 percent responsibility for any breaches or shortcomings pointed out in our items. Unfortunately, however, it is rarely to be encountered. There is total lack of punishment for those who respond to critical items in the mass news media very tardily, who do not respond at all, or else who simply send a formal reply. This problem affects in particular the work of oblast, city, or rayon newspapers where journalists are often powerless in the face of various officials hiding behind the palisade of bureaucratic instructions.

The hero of our time takes shape in deeds, in struggle and in labor, and is a very fitting hero, V.A. Korotich, chief editor of the journal OGONEK, said. Publicity and openness presuppose not only our contemporary's own skill and desire to have his say, but also his ability to heed other people's opinions and not be afraid of them. It is impermissible for truth to be habitually replaced by all sorts of "considerations."

It is necessary to learn to live and work under conditions of democracy, to get used to the fact that even though the press may not be a soldier of restructuring, it is not an orderly, either. For the sake of lofty principles, the Soviet press has no right to sink down to untruths, it has no right to engage in interdepartmental squabbles.

We must always carry along a precise sense of reality and responsibility. We are responsible for everything -- for peace on the planet and for the life on it -- and we are only struggling for the future. We are responsible for the fate of October, the fate of socialism -- there is not, and there has never been any greater responsibility.

Unfortunately, the report gave insufficient attention to foreign policy problems, the problems of ideological struggle, M.B. Leshchinskiy, the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting own correspondent on Afghanistan, said. We often are inferior to our adversaries in ideological struggle.

The speaker raised the question of relations between author and editor. We still lack respect for a journalist's labor, he said. There is no respect from editors. Who has given them the right to make changes in materials without notifying the author? This is what I mean by disrespect.

It is necessary, the delegate believes, to play an active part in the life of the servicemen who have served in Afghanistan. It is necessary that the high note on which they return home should be maintained. These people are invaluable. They are the ones whose hands we must now use to conduct active restructuring in all spheres of life.

G.G. Lazarev, editor of Orel Oblast's Uritskiy Rayon newspaper NOVAYA ZHIZN, shared his experience of work under the conditions of restructuring. [paragraph continues]

A precise line of encouraging to the utmost a newspaper's organizational function has taken shape in the press at grassroots level. The editorial office has attached to labor collectives responsible people who strive to more fully cover their multifaceted life and primarily any advanced experience. To introduce this experience more swiftly, the following procedure has been adopted by the editorial office: Once material has been published, any letters with requests to study this experience or about the possibility of introducing it are forwarded to the economic leaders.

Regarding the problems of party leadership of the rayon press, the speaker stressed the need for competent intervention by party committees in the affairs of their press organs.

We cannot but be worried by the clearly noticeable gap between the activity of the central and the local press, A.K. Varsobin, chairman of the Leningrad Oblast Journalists Organization, said. One of the reasons for this gap is to be sought in the sharply changed nature of out entire press and in changes in the very term "local press."

In the speaker's opinion, the central press is restructuring itself more quickly and is pulling ahead. The picture is quite different in the press at grassroots level, which has, indeed, always solved just its own problems and has been suddenly forced to rise to the level of all-party and all-state problems, even if only on the basis of local fact. We found ourselves unprepared for profound analytical work, unprepared both professionally and organizationally. Internal reserves have not been fully mobilized. Both the national economy and our own work demand a serious restructuring of the structure and a businesslike and principled certification of each link.

The newspaper editorial offices, N.Kh. Garifullina, editor of the Alma-Ata Oblast newspaper OGNI ALATAU, said in her speech, receive hundreds of letters rebuffing the occurrences of nationalistic displays and emphasizing that no one will ever succeed in subverting the fraternal unity and friendship of our country's peoples.

We Kazakh journalists are aware that nowhere else is the cost of shoddy work as high as it is in ideological, party, and journalistic work. Wherever we keep silent or fail to complete our work, the vacuum is immediately filled by alien morals and alien ideology. There is nothing more dangerous than formulas and stereotypes in journalistic thinking and work.

A process of restoring a healthy life is underway in the republic, the speaker said, mass news media are restructuring themselves, and the principle of justice is being affirmed.

Journalists working in the in-house press comprise a large detachment, S.B. Loginov, editor of the Ustinovskiy Radio Plant newspaper RADIST, noted. This makes it incumbent upon the USSR Journalists Union and its creative commissions and section to acquire a better understanding of the work, needs, and requirements of plant newspaper workers and help them more in their creative growth.

The speaker suggested that the creative union should organize seminars for editors of in-house newspapers by zones, including one for the Urals zone, to enable them to jointly discuss pressing problems, get rid of hack-work, and learn from frontranking, competent, and enterprising journalists. [paragraph continues]

It has always been harmful for a newspaperman, he emphasized, to shut himself within his own circle and stew in his own juices; it is simply impermissible in the course of the restructuring underway in the country.

M.N. Poltoranin, chairman of the Moscow City Journalists Organization Board, voiced the opinion that the improvement of the economic machinery is indisputably something necessary, but human history has never known a perfect economic machinery which would eliminate all problems by itself. Nor is it likely that there will ever be one, at least not until such time as it is manned by the perfect steward. More attention must be given to the maker of this machinery, to man. To restructure mentality, the speaker emphasized, means to awaken people's sense of shame for poor workmanship and irresponsibility, for hypocrisy and cowardice. These tasks are impossible to accomplish without the further development of criticism. Criticism must be well-argued, considered, and constructive.

When we speak about restructuring, we concentrate our attention more often on shortcomings, Kh.Z Nazirov, secretary of the Uzbek Journalists Union Board, noted. We must also speak of our achievements. The speaker cited the new forms of work adopted by the USSR Journalists Union and aimed at businesslike and specific actions as one of these achievements. At the same time, the speaker pointed out what he believed to be substantial errors in the structure of the creative union and the position of republic and oblast journalists organizations. He talked in particular about the regulation of the labor of chairmen and secretaries of the boards of these organizations and the staff structure of their boards. The speaker proposed that this provision be enshrined in the USSR Journalists Union Statute. There were also complaints about the unabating paperwork existing within the union, which not only is at odds with the sensible demands of the time but also, and to a large extent, hinders creative activity.

V.A. Lingis, section chief at KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, organ of the Lithuanian Komsomol Central Committee, devoted his speech to problems of the young people's press and the expansion of openness. He said that people used to say: This cannot be printed. Asked "Why?", they replied: It simply can't. Things are different now. They say: This, young man, can be printed, but why do you have to print it? When we ask "Why?", we are given a very diplomatic reply: This is not a typical case, this is sensationalism, this is explosive stuff, and so on.

We strive not to confuse serious criticism and ordinary fault-finding. Even so, however, there is a worrying and alarming thought: What if this stance were to turn into a barrier against openness.

The speaker also drew attention to the need for thorough selection of young men and women to study at state univesities' faculties of journalism, and conduct the higher school reform in such a way as to ensure that the graduates of these faculties can meet all the demands of our time.

Positive changes in the development of journalists' education are still insignificant, Ya.N. Zasurskiy, dean of the Moscow State University Faculty of Journalism, said. Unfortunately, the situation has deteriorated in many places. Now, when restructuring is underway in the country, it must also affect the education of journalists. It must be noted, however, that our material and technical base is poor and does not meet modern requirements. It is necessary to rely more on experienced practitioners who can do quite a lot.

This year we in the Moscow State University will have no vocational guidance discussions, and competition among school leavers for university places will be tougher. Purposeful recruitment is progressing with great difficulty. So far, journalists organizations have adopted a passive attitude toward this work. What we need is more real assistance. This will make it possible to form a better student body.

In conclusion, the speaker talked of the need to improve the quality of tuition in faculties of journalism and students' practical work in editorial offices, and th' difficulties arising through the shortage of textbooks and qualified practitioner-lecturers.

I envy my journalist colleagues writing on domestic topics, IZVESTIYA political observer A.Ye. Bovin said. I envy them because the comrades dealing with domestic problems have started writing interesting and intelligent articles which get right down to the point. They nurture the civic awareness and party mindedness of the readers, they educate them in truth -- the only means capable of nurturing these qualities. I envy them because, against this background, one can clearly notice the lagging behind of the branch of journalism I represent, international journalism.

The speaker dwelled in detail in the problems of restructuring in the work of international journalists.

Imperialism is preparing for war, and a crushing one at that. No one is likely to deny this. A struggle is also being waged on the ideological front, A.I. Kirillov, editor of the Baltic Military District newspaper ZA RODINU, said. Unfortunately, we do not always see these issues raised on the pages of our civilian newspapers. At times they even embark on simplistic presentation of materials on the subject of the Soviet Army: Everything is fine, nothing but heroes.

Of course, our soldiers -- patriots and internationalists -- are excellent in their service. Nonetheless, the preparation of young people for army service is still not up to contemporary requirements. Obedience is well instilled in the Army, but there are not enough people capable of independent decisionmaking. This is exactly what happens in combat: Commanders must command [beru komandovaniye na sebya]. It is questions like these military journalists raise on the pages of our newspaper.

It is not easy in the Army, the speaker concluded, but restructuring is underway: We are struggling to overcome conservatism, stagnation, and other shortcomings. I think the Armed Forces will be stronger and better as a result.

O.D. Yakimov, chairman of the Yakutsk Journalists Union Board, dwelled on the role of the press in international education. He noted that international propaganda in the press is detached from the real processes of socialist internationalization, from questions like the development of local nationalities, the formation of a national working class detachment, and the combination of national and international interests in all spheres of social life. The reason for this detachment is the fact that journalists do not consider in depth the meaning of contemporary processes of internationalization, pick up quantitative indicators, laud prosperity, and leave aside many serious problems.

The speaker also discussed questions of training cadres for the national press.

On instructions from mass news media workers in Georgia, N.G. Cherkezishvili, chairman of the republican Journalists Union Board, expressed ardent gratitude to the country's journalists for the support they gave during the natural disasters in Georgia.

Millions of Soviet people learned of the calamity which befell the republic, offered a helping hand, and accepted other people's misfortune as their own. It is indicative that, before the number of the special Gosbank account was published, remittances were being sent to newspapers and television offices. This can be seen as nothing else but a manifestation of trust in journalists and the press, trust in everything they are doing for the expansion of publicity and democratism and the restructuring of our common cause, the speaker stressed. This trust is transformed into a considerable material force capable of rallying amd mobilizing people -- this constitutes a tremendous creative and professional responsibility. Speaking of journalism in Georgia which has traditions of struggle against negative phenomena, the speaker noted, however, that it still does not march in the vanguard of restructuring in the republic, and has not yet become a collective organizer as demanded by the time.

N.M. Ryzhova, editor of Murmansk Oblast's city newspaper KIROVSKIY RABOCHIY, spoke of the need for more attention to the local press by party and economic organs and by journalists from central newspapers and journals. The USSR Journalists Union Board must shown some concern to ensure that central press workers on official travel call at local editorial offices not just to secure a hotel room but also for creative contacts. Further development is also needed regarding creative ties with foreign journalists.

The speaker drew her colleagues' attention to the need for objective presentation of local affairs, and cited examples of mistakes in the preparation of some materials.

We can feel that restructuring is a complex and difficult matter, V.A. Karpenko, editor of the newspaper VECHERNIY KIEV, said. Today there is not a single person who is uninvolved in this revolutionary process. It is very good that our congress managed to produce only a little trilling by songbirds. The speakers were mainly people who have rolled up their sleeves and got down to retructuring.

It often happens, however, that journalists who are the keenest champions of criticism are also the ones who fear it most. We conducted a postal poll of our readers. We received a mass of letters, often containing the remark: "I know that you won't publish this." They were the ones we published. This brought on a second avalanche. We received more than 1,000 letters in 6 weeks.

There was talk in the editorial office, the congress delegate continued, whether there had been any need to "wash our dirty linen" in public. It took some time for people to get used to properly accepting criticism against themselves.

The speaker also spoke of how cadres questions in letters sections ought to be resolved more efficiently.

He discussed the need to improve the work of publishing houses and lift the bans restructuring the economic independence of leaders of newspapers and journalists organizations.

The journalists who are armed with the pen write in an original and fresh manner. Those who hold the photographic camera still work in the old fashion, monotonously, and often stereotypically, G.V. Koposov, chairman of the All-Union Photographic Commission, asserted. We photographic journalists are not the only ones to blame; many of you leaders of editorial offices are also be blame. After all, the photographic section must be an independent organ. One of the most important tasks is to enhance the demandingness toward reporters by the editorial collective. Returns can be expected then.

The speaker spoke of the need to train photographic reporter cadres and to provide broader press coverage of the problems of the development of this branch of journalism, in which very many people are interested.

The congress continues its work.

RASPUTIN SPEAKS ON OPENNESS, ENVIRONMENT

PM191137 [Editorial Report] Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Mar 1987 Morning Edition carries on page 6 under the rubric "Viewpoint" and the headline "Order in the Soul, Order in the Fatherland" a 1,800-word 50th birthday interview with Valentin Rasputin, author of "The Conflagration," by TASS correspondent V. Khodiy on the theme of restructuring and openness and Rasputin's concern for environmental protection. "In the coming years, as a result of economic reforms and measures," Rasputin argues, "we will get nearer to meeting the population's requirements. This will take place by means of external progress in accordance with the laws of advantageous economics and correct relations between people and the state.

"But does that mean that external progress will lead to a corresponding progress in our souls? By no means. In a healthy body there does not always dwell a healthy spirit." Rasputin argues the importance of sound moral values and avoid breeding "cold, business-minded, calculating people on the Western model."

He emphasizes the importance of the lessons of Lake Baykal, which he describes as "a science of how and how not to manage one's resources," noting that it is now recognized that the pulp combines on Baykal and the Selenga river should never have been built. He writes further: "Openness is not just the provision of objective information on the present state of affairs in the country. It is also the need to tell the truth about th past, not omitting to say how, through whose fault it was possible that ruinous arbitrary decisions were taken. Otherwise we will soon be back where we started. It will happen in accordance with the law of suppression and connivance. Total licence will breed more total licence. The sense of impunity will spread and gradually take over the space that we have cleaned up." He warns: "Siberia is vast, but greedy hands of ministries and departments, mindful only of their present gain, are longer and they reach to its furthest corners. So far nothing has changed this method of management."

BUDAPEST MEDIA INTERVIEW EDITORS ON 'GLASNOST'

Yakovlev, Rorotich, Pyanov

LD240019 Budapest Television Service in Hungarian 2025 GMT 19 Mar 87

["Panorama program; no video available]

[Text] A few weeks ago we reported on the effect of the policy of openness -- or glasnost -- on Soviet television. This time we shall be discussing the changes taking place in the printed press. Andras Sugar spoke on the occasion of the Congress of Soviet Journalists to editors-in-chief of several big papers. I would add that the people in question are new editors-in-chief of old papers.

Not even television and radio have managed to push the printed press into the background in the USSR.

The Soviet people have always been, and continue to be, a nation of newspaper readers. Every day 8,000 newspapers are published in 180 million copies. But these figures are already outdated. Today more newspapers are ready probably than ever before.

[Begin recording] [Yegor Yakovlev, editor-in-chief of MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI identified by caption, speaking in Russian with superimposed Hungarian translation] The Soviet press has changed in many respects recently. There were not enough readable papers in the past, and change is always more noticeable when it begins from zero. The fundamental principles are the same for all the papers. The first is that the paper must be open toward society, there are no forbidden topics. We publish everything we consider necessary; we talk about everything.

[Sugar] Where do you draw the line in the policy of openness?

[Yakovlev] In my view there are no limits to openness -- if there is a limit then there is no openness, no glasnost. It is another matter that there are some people, especially foreign gentlemen, who visit the editorial offices of MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI and ask who opposes openness, as if the people were divided on the subject. In my view they do not understand these matters because openness unites people. If everything can be openly talked about then it does not divide the people. Something that is a secret does divide people, it divides them into different camps. On one side of the barricade stand those guarding the secrets, and on the other side are those from whom the secrets are concealed. Openness, on the other hand, unites people.

[Sugar] It cannot be denied that the reforms have already borne fruit, and one of the most valuable fruits is openness, which everyone agrees with, more or less. What will the reform spirit, the restructuring, have to achieve in your opinion to convince everybody of its significance?

[Yakovlev] Results are needed especially in the economic sphere. I have been working at this paper since August and since then I have transformed the paper. If I were the manager of, say, the Togliatti factory then I would not have been able to transform it within 6 months. We must show results first and foremost in the economic sphere. Of course the results can be first seen in the press, in artistic life, but all this is only the surface. The most important thing is the economy.

[Sugar] You recently became the editor of the magazine OGONEK and since then the paper has been transformed beyond recognition. It used to be a rather boring paper which, as they say, used to languish in the waiting rooms of dentists virtually unread. Now everybody is talking about the paper. How do you explain this?

[Vitaliy Korotich, chief editor of OGONEK, identified by caption, in Russian with superimposed Hungarian translation] It is clear that the paper has changed, the people working for the paper have changed and times have changed. Everybody is as talented as the era in which he lives allows his talents to blossom. Now the times are favorable to those people who wish to depict life instead of inventing stories. Apart from this I consider it very important that a paper should write about real problems. For the moment we are only experimenting, this is a very, very difficult thing, you know. It is still our obligation to paint a credible picture of our age.

[Sugar] You say it is very difficult. Why is it difficult?

[Korotich] Primarily because many people are finding it hard to get used to the atmosphere of democracy. Many people were probably inoculated against democracy in their childhood, the same way as the bulldog has its tail cut off. Such people quickly accept that this is the order of things. If they have a grievance they do not come to me, they do not even talk to me. They turn directly to the government, not to the courts -- I would be happy if they went to court. They do not go there, but turn instead to the Party's Central Committee and the government and demand that they be left in peace.

[Sugar] What happens when they take their complaint to the party, the Central Committee?

[Korotich] Nothing. The same as now, namely, that while we are talking here, we hear the patter of footsteps. This also happens to me. When I write, I hear the patter of footsteps behind me, that people are shuffling about and talking about me. It must be said that the party now has a very good standpoint. One is not dragged from one place to the other. The only thing they ask is that I prove on what basis we accused X or Y of this thing or that. I am always very happy to oblige. On top of this, I also take responsibility if I make a mistake. I am happy to apologize if I happen to make a mistake. But I would not like it very much if there were subjects I could talk about and others I could not. After all, openness is either openness or it does not exist. It is not possible to be open to a certain limit and to say that sorry, there is no openness beyond that.

[Sugar] Is there no limit to openness?

[Korotich] For the moment, there is none. Or rather, I would say that openness has traditional ethical limits. In England, for example, the king cannot be insulted.

[Sugar] That is no longer true. It is allowed now, even on television.

[Korotich] Yes, but a gentleman does not do such a thing.

[Sugar] A program called "Spitting Image" on London TV even features savage caricatures of the Queen.

[Korotich] Maybe you are right, but gentlemen have not yet become accustomed to this, so I think there is a list of topics that we do not discuss for the moment.

[Sugar] For how long have you worked at KROKODIL?

[Aleksey Pyanov, editor-in-chief of KROKODIL identified by caption, in Russian with superimposed Hungarian translation] For just over a year.

[Sugar] In that time KROKODIL has changed almost beyond recognition. How did you achieve that?

[Pyanov] Well, this is a paper which used to be run by the outstanding writer Mikhail Koltsov, a paper for which such excellent writers as Ilf, Petrov, Bulgakov, Yuriy Karlovich Alesha, and Zoshchenko formerly worked. This paper has a great tradition.

It is difficult for us to attain the high standards they have set. Have we changed? We live in times today when our paper has a sharper tone than usual. It is true that this may be slightly to the deteriment of our literary profile. But in the social and political sense there are new requirements. The tone is different. This is probably what gets noticed. After all, the relationship with the essential ingredient of the paper, satire, has changed. The limits have shifted and the possibilities have expanded. More important topics can become and do become the focus of our invvestigations. We have more effective means for intervening in certain processes. This is perhaps what our readers noticed.

At least we endeavor to ensure that the words "restructuring" and "acceleration" feature as seldom as possible in our columns. The words, I repeat. But the articles, short stories, writings, drawings, and cartoons should reflect as much as possible the fact that restructuring is really taking place.

[Sugar] Where in your opinion is the limit to openness? Where is the line that cannot be overstepped?

[Pyanov] Openness is not a fad, not a pastime, but the basis for existence -- for the press and also for the people. To be honest, this has always been the case; this has always been so in Russian literature. Puishkin, Dostoevsky,Toltsoy -- they themselves were openness. They expressed the people's thoughts openly.

For this precise reason I think it should be clarified more precisely and realistically how we must use this means. We have no experience as yet. Some time ago, we only made references to this in short exposes. Today there are leading artiles about it in PRAVDA.

So what can the writer of exposes do in such a situation? Tell me what. We are living through the crisis of the style of our paper. The writing of exposes is losing its value now. Readers nowadays read a report on a party conference with much more interest than say a polished, well-written expose. In other words, the facts gain prominence over the style. People are curious to find out what is happening today. Everyone is concerned primarily with the measures that have been taken and how the democratic transformation is becoming enriched. [end recording]

## Bovin: 'Purifying Fire'

LD291427 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 1500 GMT 28 Mar 87

[Interview with Aleksandr Bovin of IZVESTIYA by correspondent Istvan Kulcsar, date and place not given -- recorded in Russian with superimposed Hungarian translation; from the "168 Hours" program]

[Text] [announcer] Next week the "International Studio" program on television will deal with the social and economic processes currently taking place in the USSR. The program will analyze the new style of domestic and foreign policy in the USSR, the latest twists in U.S. -USSR relations anf the expected outcome of the arms limitation talks. One of the four foreign journalists participating in the roundtable debate will be Aleksandr Bovin of IZVESTIYA. Istvan Kucsar has interviewed Aleksandr Bovin:

[Kulcsar] Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich, you have often said that you are a child of the 20th congress, figuratively speaking, of course. But what did you do specifically in the year of the 20th congress, and what have you been doing in the three decades since then?

[Bovin] I was 25 years old then, and no matter how strange it may sound now, I headed the agitation and propaganda department of an obkom in the northern Caucasus. At my age it was a rather high post. So that is when the 20th congress took place. The ideas that emerged there shaped me as a person and as a Communist. That is when my own restructuring [perestroyka], my own transformation, occurred which has been going on ever since.

In the meantime I have been a party worker and journalist, but no matter what I was doing in my work I always tried to realize the goals the 20th congress had pinned on its banner. This was not always easy, but as a Communist I felt this was the main task of my life. I am very glad that 30 years later we can again return to these problems, because without solving the question, in order words without socialist democracy, without the development of real democracy, we cannot live and progress as a socialist country.

[Kulcsar] My next question is connected with glasnost, openness. It is interpreted in many different ways. Some say, especially in the West, that it is a tactical move, almost a trick. According to others openness is an organic component of the restructuring. What is your opinion?

[Bovin] I think it is neither a component nor a trick but the very essence of democracy. It is often asked what guarantee there is that we will really carry out this or that task. This is a somewhat abstract approach to the question, because there is no external guarantee. Only we ourselves can be the guarantee. As far as the relative guarantees, such as the deepening of openness, are concerned, well, this happens to be one of the real guarantees for making the process of restructuring irreversible. It is obvious, after all, that without openness democracy cannot exist. Without it one cannot feel that he is the master of his country, party or even his factory.

Openness is one of the fundamental concomitants of the processes taking place in the USSR today, despite the fact that day after day I read about terrible things when I open the newspapers: Party secretaries and ministers are convicted, corruption and backhanders exist in the USSR. It is painful for me, as a communist and a patriot, to read about such things. It concerns my country and people who are in the same party as I, but I understand that it is necessary. This is the purifying fire through which we must pass so that we can continue our work with clean hands and a clear conscience.

On the other hand openness cannot be restricted to negative phenomena only. Today it is inevitable of course these should be the focus of attention because we must combat them. The dissemination of the experiences in the vanguard also belongs to the theme of openness, as does the idea that someone working in Moscow should feel that the man in Kamchatka is fighting with him for the same goal and cause. In time this positive side of openness will become increasingly prominent, although the struggle against mistakes will continue to play a part.

[Kulcsar] Let us stay with openness. You spoke about this issue at the recent Congress of Soviet Journalists. According to some sources you criticized the Soviet Foreign and Defense Ministries for hindering openness. According to other sources this is not what you said. So what did you really say?

[Bovin] In reality this is not quite what I said. I said that on the question of openness -- and this is also the party's declared view -- there could be no areas exempt from open analysis and criticism.

I expounded that this is a splendid goal that is beginning to take shape but we have to face the facts. There are still areas in which it is difficult to objectively analyze certain decisions. For me as a foreign affairs journalist the activities of the Foreign and Defense Ministries are such areas. They have a direct influence on foreign policy, but as a journalist I can by no means criticize the decisions of these ministries.

[Kulcsar] On Thursday you participated in the recording of Hungarian television's "International Studio" program. Did you find the debate exciting?

[Bovin] Well, yes, but you know I had the impression sometimes that the discussion was -- how shall I put it -- too friendly, as though five good friends had gathered around the table. We sat there and exchanged kind words, despite the fact that we represented different social systems, East and West. In my view this was not really felt in the different approaches to the questions. The debate did not become sharp. Then I thought: To hell with it. We have become so used to having arguments that when consensus develops in some questions we begin to wonder. Yet maybe this indicates the extent of progress, the fact that people with different world outlooks say nearly the same thing about the fundamental questions of our age. So have we really matured for a universal approach and global solution to the problems? If this is the case we can only be happy about it.

## 'BANKRUPTCY' OF LENINGRAD BUILDING TRUST NOTED

LD260946 Moscow TASS in English 0817 GMT 26 Mar 87

[Text] Leningrad March 26 TASS -- TASS correspondent Boris Pavlov writes:

Two thousand workers and employees of a big building trust which has gone bankrupt in Leningrad have now to take jobs with other organisations. According to the Soviet legislation they are all given jobs according to their qualifications.

Even older people cannot recall any such bankruptcies occurring in the USSR. What has happened to a new system of economic management has immediately made it clear who is who. Most trusts in the city have begun to spend their manpower and material resources more rationally. As to the managers of the bankrupt trust they continued to rely on administrative methods. As a result they often fell behind schedule in building installations planned, overran their cost limits and failed to ensure a proper quality of work.

So the trust, failing to change its style of work in conditions of cost-accounting and self-financing, was operating at a loss. The Leningrad building association, functioning under the city council of people's deputies, decided to disband the trust and divide is assets among prospering organisations.

This is a sad fact. But the workers of the bankrupt trust found it no cause for pessimism, although it gave them much food for thought. The leaders of the building association and local city soviets offered them a choice of new jobs without affecting their uniterrupted service record on which the size of sickness benefits and pensions depends.

There is no doubt that the healthy competition that has appeared in the Soviet Union under new conditions of economic management, will make many other executives change their style of work. The Draft Law on the State Enterprise (Association), now being widely discussed in the USSR, provides for the possibility of liquidating insolvent organisations.

## RESTRUCTURING IN PETROCHEMICAL INDUSTRY VIEWED

PM261507 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 12, 22 Mar 87 p 13

[Interview with USSR Oil-Refining and Petrochemical Industry Minister Nikolay Lemayev by Aleksandr Guber: "Learn How Not To Be Late"]

[Text) It would seem to be the simplest of things to find someone willing to discuss the reconstruction, since everyone is speaking about it. [paragraph continues]

However, it really is quite the opposite if you're speaking practically about what has already been accomplished, and if you ask the person not to quote others, but to speak on how he or she are reorganizing themselves.

Nikolay Vasilyevich Lemayev was appointed Minister in autumn 1985. Before that he worked for over two decades as the director of the Nizhekamskiy petrochemical plant (in latter years it was made into a production association]. He was appointed director when neither the plant nor the city was yet in existence. When he left Nizhekamsk, the association became the biggest enterprise in the industry and the city's population exceeded 170,000.

Today Lemayev the Minister looks at things from a different angle than Lemayev the director did. Although he did insist on cardinal changes in our economy in the past, too, he managed to produce good results even in the conditions of the old economic system. In particular, the Nizhekamsk plant's output was in demand at international markets for its technical standard of production.

But, in the past, Lemayev had a single enterprise, and now -- a whole industry to think about. And the things he has managed (at the price of superhuman effort) to achieve will, probably, be unattainable at the new scale and with the same methods.

How does Lemayev regard reconstruction now? What has changed in his work since the outset of this year when all the enterprises in the industry were transferred to a complete self-supporting and self-financing basis? He says:

"You wish to prove that I support reconstruction even after I've become a Minister? But I suppose it's much harder to find anyone today who'd say something against it. But the most resolute words have already been said. It's high time to translate them into reality. And that's exactly what we're doing."

[Guber] What have you achieved already?

[Lemayev] We haven't yet worked a full quarter of a year under the new system. Therefore, we'll be summing up the results later on. There's no need to hurry -- it isn't healthy to do so.

Our industry has 209 enterprises with an aggregate staff of 800,000 workers. Reconstruction, naturally, has a bearing on the interests of each one of them. Can everything change in a few weeks? And if, due to various reasons, the results of the quarter will be different from what we had expected, shall we be right to blame the new system?

The eagerness to see the fruits of reconstruction as soon as possible is quite understandable.

However, this eagerness must not be expressed outright, sometimes in spite of objective data. I remember how in 1986 the results of the first quarter were good and the report of the Central Statistical Board read like a poem. And the journalists added grist to it -- see, the fruits of reconstruction! Afterwards the growth rates turned out to be slower. Doubts were generated -- and what about the reconstruction? And the matter was really in that the first quarter of 1986 was compared with the same period of the preceding year which had been very poor. On top of that, it had less working days than the first quarter of 1986.

[Guber] All right, let's bide our time with a summing up of the results. But what did change, after all?

[Lemayev] People began to get interested in questions which they never thought about before. Here's an example. This year the demand for polyisoprene -- a type of synthetic rubber -- has fallen, as compared with the calculations for the five-year plan. The fact as it is can only be hailed -- we'll save a consideriable amount of fuel and raw materials -- but the lowering of capacities of the enterprises producing rubber diminishes their output. In the past this didn't bother the enterprises much, for their plan would have been "corrected" and that was all. And, to put it bluntly, the enterprises would retain all their funds, even producing less than before. How it's different -- the reduction of net output and profit leads to a reduction of the wages fund and the fund of economic incentives. And that is already felt by each and everyworker. The collectives, therefore, have to seek for a way out of this predicament.

[Guber] And do they always make the right choice?

[Lemayev] The administrators of some enterprises posed the question on compensation of their losses out of the Ministry reserves. But we couldn't do that because of the profit-and-loss-accounting system.

[Guber] But wouldn't that have been fair?

[Lemayev] If we reason in the old way, then the answer is yes. But in the new economic conditions, it is impossible to count on someone at the top to find a solution for you. You were offered independence, you are the master with all the rights, duties and responsibilities stemming thereof. And it is very good that many people have realized this correctly.

[Guber] As far as I can remember, some people used to explain your successes as a director by your capability to win over your superiors to solve this or the other question in your favour and to get the materials in short supply -- was it really so?

[Lemayev] Yes, that was correct. I can't understand why sometimes such activities are treated sardinically. You see, the economic management system was like this then -- and also it still remains such to a great measure even now. Everything is centralized. There is not enough of everything for everyone. Therefore, things are given, first of all, to those who can demand them. And they are given again if you managed to use what you's been given better than others did.

The situation is gradually changing. Now you don't have to demand things -- you must earn them. But some people prefer to go on demanding as before.

[Guber] Therefore, the main thing that is changing is the transfer from management by decree to economic management levers?

[Lemayev] To be precise, it is the very beginning of such a transfer. The new conditions of economic management must be strictly abided by at all levels. To date this is a non-existent. Our enterprises have gone over to a new index of our work -- net output, but we're still dominated by the old index -- commodity output in the 1922 prices. The territorial organs, trying to make the indices of different industries compatible, do not take into account the specific conditions of work of the sectors which have transferred to new conditions.

The self-financing industry doesn't operate in a void. It is connected with all the other sectors by thousands of threads, including its suppliers and consumers. [paragraph continues]

But they work according to a different system, and their indices, which they consider important are different. Problems difficult to settle are arising, and will continue to arise, until everything will be reduced to one and the same system.

[Guber] Let's talk about the part of profit which remains at the disposal of the enterprises. As I understand it, "remains at the disposal" should not be understood too literally, isn't that so?

[Lemayev] It shouldn't. The norms for distributing it according to various articles are quite strict. But the trouble is not in this. A considerable part of the profit must be used for building up the capacities envisaged in the five-year plan. And this is precisely the case when the interests of a self-supporting enterprise do not always coincide with the interests of the national economy reflected in the plan.

For example, in conditions of self-financing the enterprises are not interested in sharply increasing the output of liquid paraffins for making fodder protein. The state needs this output but it isn't profitable for the enterprise. When the economic lever fails we have to resort to rule by decree. These shortcomings in the economic mechanism must be overcome as soon as possible.

[Guber] These are, so to speak, external hindrances for the independence of enterprises, but are there internal hindrances, too?

[Lemayev] And how! All of us are just starting to get used to independence, democracy, openness and responsibility. Not to the words themselves, they have become quite usual already, but to their essence. It is much more quickly that one sees who's who in the new conditions. It is one thing to perform instructions and be able to report to your superiors, and quite a different thing is to be answerable to your own collective for real results.

For a long time we were training managers practically for the first version. It would be naive to expect for the managers of the second kind to appear overnight out of nothing. Now it is becoming clear how well grounded were our complaints on the scarcity of independence and on guardianship even in trifles. But now independence has been granted us, so it would seem that we should make free use of it. But, no, I prefer to ask once more, to agree upon my actions with my superiors -- it is more reliable that way. It is impossible to get rid of such psychology at theoretical lessons. Only practical work and a job which you are fully responsible can help you out.

Today the conditions themselves are forcing the directors to act, rather than wait for instructions. The new system, for example, makes it possible to raise wages considerably. No one sets a ceiling for it. Everyone realized this aspect at once and hailed it. But the lower limit is also basent -- and many people failed to grasp this. The well-being of each and every worker depends on the decision which is taken by the director together with the work collective. In the past is was possible, in principle, to exist witout deciding anything, only performing what had been ordered, but now it is no longer possible to do so unless you wish to have your pocket empty. This, naturally, presupposes the right of the work collective to elect its own manager, of whom the workers are confident that he won't let their families starve. We are still to learn how to elect directors in earnest so as not to turn this into an empty show.

[Gruber] As I remember, you were always quite independent. You often did things that most of the other directors didn't dare do. Did you take risks?

[Lemayev] Of course. I took risks. Especially at first when the city and the plant were just beginning. To do the job I violated a mass of instructions, received reprimands, but managed to deliver the goods -- hoping that winners are not tried. Instructions, of course, are issued not for the sake of being violated. This involves a very serious moral and even a legal problem, with which I don't care dealing with now. But if we had abided by all the instructions, we would not have built such a city and such an enterprise.

[Guber] And do you now recommend that the other directors do the same?

[Lemayev] A minister cannot call on his subordinates to violate instructions. But in our national economy we have about 200,000 different instructions. The majority of them should have been abolished a long time ago. And this task could finally happen given today's conditions. We've cleansed our ministry rather drastically.

## ECONOMIST ABALKIN VIEWS SYSTEM UPDATING

LD261638 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1952 GMT 25 Mar 87

[Text] Moscow, 25 Mar (TASS) -- Three to 4 years are needed for the transfer to the integral system of management of the Soviet national economy. Leonid Abalkin, director of the Institute of Economy of the Academy of Sciences, thinks that by then conditions for the qualitative leap in the improvement of the economic and social characteristics of the Soviet society will have been created. Today, he shared his prognosis at the meeting with Soviet and foreign journalists.

By the beginning of the next 5-year plan (1991-95), continued Abalkin, each Soviet enterprise will be given a chance to determine the outlook of its activity for the forthcoming period relying on modern economic methods: full financial autonomy, self-financing, and self-recouping. A sharp improvement in qualitative indicators and an increase of labor productivity are not possible without a profound transformation of economic mechanism. "We are moving from individual experiments toward an integral system but as yet we are just taking the first steps in this direction," said the scientist.

Leonid Abalkin stressed that the institute's efforts are focused on the issues that will improve the economic mechanism. In particular research is being carried out systematically on the development of cooperative form of ownership and individual labor activity. More attention has been given to the analysis of socialist relations of production and their dialectical interaction with the developing forces of production.

It was noted at the meeting with the journalists that the work on cadres selection, placement, and training has been subjected to a critical examination by the institute. Their attestation was carried out in the atmosphere of openness [glasnost], objectivity, adherance to principle and high exactingness. Effective measures have been adopted to strengthen the individual responsibility of each employee for the end results of the research. The search for nontraditional forms and methods of scientific work is continuing.

## AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENTS FOR 26-29 MAR

LD310022 [Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian, unless otherwise indicated, on 26-29 March. GMT times of broadcasts are given in parentheses at the end of each item.

26 March

In Kazakhstan, 2,000,000 hectares of land have already been sown. Wheat, perennial grasses and vegetables are being sown in the five southern oblasts. Land on which cotton, rice and maize are grown is being prepared. (0100) Tajikistan has started sowing cotton which is to cover more than 300,000 hectares in the republic this year. (0900) Uzbekistan has started planting cotton. This year the republic is supposed to both fulfil the plan and make up for the losses of the past years. Cotton will occupy 10,000 hectares more territory than last year. Around 175,000 hectares will be sown with a valuable fine-fibre types. It is intented to complete planting cotton in the second 10 days of April. (1600)

27 March

In the Kalmyk Caspian region preparation for spring sowing has been poor. On the sovkhozes of Chagorsda, Strana Sovetov, and Polkhvskiy half the tractors are not ready for field work. The republic has a shortfall of over 300 machine operators. There are shortages of fuel and lubricating materials and fertilizer. The Yekuburulsk, Ustinsk and other Kamyk rayons give cuase for anxiety. It was recently discovered that the number of sowing machines is insufficient. (1200)

28 March

Maize is to be grown intensively in the Kurgan Oblast. This applies to 50,000 hectares. (1200) Seeds for sowing have been prepared by the cotton-ginning enterprises of Turkmenistan and are now being dispatched to Mary and Chardzou Oblasts. More than 100,000 tonnes of seeds have been prepared incuding regionally selected types. (1200)

29 March -- No fileworthy reports monitored.

## MURAKHOVSKIY ATTENDS AGRO-INDUSTRIAL MEETING

LD260616 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 25 Mar 87

[Text] An expanded session of the collegium of the USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee was held today in Moscow. It was devoted to the tasks of implementing the decisions of the January CPSU Central Committee plenum. The chairmen of the agro-industrial committees of the union republics took part in its work.

Comrade Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, chairmen of the USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee spoke at the session. The topic under discussion was raising the efficiency of agro-industrial production, increasing production and improving the quality of the production. Issues of the rational utilization of material and fuel and energy resources were examined. The collegium demanded a radical intensification of the work to economize on these, and the broad intensification of the work to economize on these, and the broad introduction of progressive resource-saving technologies, the achievements of science and the experience of innovators.

## MOSCOW RADIO NOTES 'ASTROPHYSICAL MODULE' LAUNCH

### First in Series

LD310450 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0400 GMT 31 Mar 87

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0400 GMT on 31 March announces: "The astrophysical module Kvant [Quantum] has been put into near-Earth orbit in our country. We have received a report from the Flight Control Center. It is given by our special correspondent Sergey Zheleznyak."

In his recorded report, S. Zheleznyak begins by saying that in the main control hall an electronic panel shows that it is the final seconds in the launch count-down. Chronometers at Baykonur, at scientific surveillance stations, and on science ships in the oceans are simultaneously following the final moments to the launch, he noted. A man's voice is then heard in the background to say, "We have launch."

The enormous complex has set off into the skies, says Zheleznyak, adding: "That is how the laboratory, with a mass of more than 20 tonnes, created on earth, has started its journey to the space home of Juriy Romanenko and Aleksandr Laveykin."

Zheleznyak says that scientists call this laboratory the specialized astrohysical module Kvant. He explains: "It is consists of two parts; a laboratory compartment with a transfer airlock [Perekhodnoy kameroy] and a heremetic and nonheremtic compartment of scientific instruments."

Zhelenyak notes: "Reports coming in here from Baykonur show that the launch of the module is proceeding normally."

Zheleznyak now introduces a talk from the deputy leader of flights Viktor Dmitriyevich [surname indistinct]. He says that the Kvant astrophysical module is the first in a series of scientific modules with which the Mir station will be equipped. He says that if one thinks of the Mir station as a house, then the module can be called a work room. In response to Zheleznyak's question on how many such modules the station can receive, the official recalls that the station has six docking ports [uzlov] and one of these will be taken up by the newly launched module. The official goes on to say that four more modules can dock with the front docking ports; that is, five altogether.

Answering Zheleznyak's question about what mass will then be attained by the station, together with these modules, the deputy flight leader says "About 135 tonnes." Zheleznyak says in conclusion: "Yes, a solid structure will be obtained in orbit. Well, and now the first module is on its way."

### Launched by Proton Booster

LD310620 Moscow TASS in English 0611 GMT 31 Mar 87

[Text] Moscow March 31 TASS -- A Proton booster rocket in the Soviet Union today orbited a specialised astrophysical module for subsequent docking with the space station Mir (peace). The module, called Kvant, will be used to conduct a wide range of studies in space astronomy and cope with a number of other research and economic problems.